REPORT RESUMES

ED 018 052 EC 001 957

EVALUATION OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR PREGNANT GIRLS.

BY- RICHARDSON, ANN
BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH INC., WASH.,D.C.
REPORT NUMBER CB-PROJ-D130 PUB DATE APR 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 165P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EXCEPTIONAL CHILD RESEARCH, *PREGANANCY, PROGRAM EVALUATION, UNWED MOTHERS, ADOLESCENTS, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, NEGRO YOUTH, NEGRO MOTHERS, ATTITUDES, CITY WIDE PROGRAMS, FOLLOWUP STUDIES, INTERVIEWS, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, SEX EDUCATION, FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION, CHILD CARE, SPECIAL SCHOOLS,

TO ASSESS THE SHORT RANGE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION IN A SPECIAL SCHOOL PROGRAM ESTABLISHED IN 1963 FOR PREGNANT SCHOOL AGE GIRLS, INTERVIEWERS IN 1965 OBTAINED INFORMATION FROM 109 GIRLS WHO HAD ATTENDED THE PROGRAM IN ITS FIRST YEAR, 123 GIRLS WHO HAD BEEN REFERRED BUT HAD NOT ATTENDED, AND MOTHERS OF THE GIRLS. THE SPECIAL PROGRAM FOCUSED ON PRENATAL MEDICAL CARE, ARRANGEMENT FOR CHILD CARE, ATTITUDES TOWARD LOVE AND SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, AND WEIGHT CONTROL AND NUTRITION. IN THE FIRST YEAR OF OPERATION 142 GIRLS ATTENDED OUT OF 541 REFERRALS. ALMOST ALL WERE NEGRO, AGED 13 THROUGH 18, AND THE MAJORITY WERE NOT MARRIED AT THE TIME OF THE BABY'S BIRTH. DATA INDICATED THAT GIRLS IN THE SPECIAL PROGRAM WERE SIGNIFICANTLY MORE LIKELY (P IS LESS THAN .001) TO CONTINUE WITH REGULAR SCHOOL THAN WERE PREGNANT GIRLS NOT IN THE PROGRAM. MOST OF THE GIRLS WHO ATTENDED THE SPECIAL PROGRAM RETURNED TO REGULAR SCHOOL AFTER THE BABY'S BIRTH AND, IF THEY DROPPED OUT, DID SO SOMETIME AFTERWARD, WHEREAS THIS WAS THE CASE WITH ONLY A LITTLE OVER A FOURTH OF THE NONSPECIAL PROGRAM GROUP (P IS LESS THAN .001). THE MORE SUPPORT A GIRL HAD (SELF, FRIENDS, FAMILY), THE MORE LIKELY SHE WAS TO REMAIN IN SCHOOL (P IS LESS THAN .01 FOR SPECIAL PROGRAM GIRLS, P IS LESS THAN .05 FOR NONSPECIAL PROGRAM GIRLS). GIRLS IN THE SPECIAL PROGRAM WERE SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY (P IS LESS THAN .001) TO HAVE HAD ANOTHER BABY OR TO BE PREGNANT AGAIN BY THE TIME THEY WERE INTERVIEWED. IN REDUCING ADDITONAL PREGNANCIES, THE SPECIAL PROGRAM HAD A GREATER EFFECT UPON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS, THE GROUP FROM WHICH THE MAJORITY OF NEW CHILDREN CAME, THAN UPON HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS (P IS LESS THAN .05 FOR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS AND LESS THAN .01 FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS). GIRLS WERE ALSO SIGNIFICANTLY LESS LIKELY (P = .05) TO HAVE ANOTHER CHILD OR BE PREGNANT AGAIN IF THEY LIVED IN AN UNBROKEN FAMILY AND ATTENDED THE SPECIAL PROGRAM. AMONG THE NONSPECIAL PROGRAM GIRLS, IT MADE NO STATISTICAL DIFFERENCE WHETHER OR NOT THE FAMILY WAS BROKEN. INCLUDED ARE 59 TABLES PRESENTING DATA AND THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS USED. (DF)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED018052

BSSR

EVALUATION OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR PREGNANT GIRLS

EC 001 957
Eric

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR PREGNANT GIRLS

Conducted for the Public Schools
of the District of Columbia
as part of a Child Welfare Demonstration Grant of the Children's Bureau
of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
(Project D130)

Elizabeth M. Goodman, Project Director and Principal
Fobola M. L. Gill, Assistant Principal

by

Ann Richardson

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

April 1966

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

in cooperation with

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

and

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

MEMBERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Wesley S. Williams, President
Mr. Carl C. Smuck, Vice President
Colonel West A. Hamilton
Dr. Euphemia L. Haynes
Rev. Everett A. Hewlett
Dr. Preston A. McLendon, Chairman of Health and Special Education Services Committee
Mrs. Gloria K. Roberts
Mrs. Louise S. Steele
Mr. Irving B. Yochelson
Miss Gertrude L. Williamson, Executive Secretary

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. Carl F. Hansen

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. John D. Koontz

DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Dr. Murray Grant

CHIEF, BUREAU OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Dr. Samuel Schwartz

DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Donald D. Brewer

CHIEF, CHILD WELFARE DIVISION

Mrs. Alice R. Smith

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE PROJECT

Miss Elma H. Ashton
Miss Edith M. Baker
Mr. Louis H. Bean
Dr. I. Blanche Bourne
Mrs. Lois B. Earl
Mrs. Louise W. Erlbeck
Mrs. Fobola M. L. Gill
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Goodman
Mrs. Naomi Hardiman
Miss Jean Hoodwin
Mrs. Helene Lit
Mrs. Ethel L. Neustadter
Miss Janet H. Pfleger

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

PREFATORY SUMMARY. vii

INTRODUCTION 1

- A Brief Background 1
- The Organization of the Program. 2
- The Evaluation 5
- The Study Design 6
- The Organization of the Report 10

THE GIRLS: THEIR BACKGROUNDS AND CHARACTERISTICS. 12

- Illegitimacy in the Environment. 28
- The Babies' Fathers. 33
- The Babies 40

THE PROCESS OF GETTING TO WEBSTER AND WHAT HAPPENED THERE. 52

- Perceptions of the School. 55
- The Time at Webster. 57
- The Special Aspects of the Program 63
- On the Question of Visibility. 67

THE EVALUATION: THE RETURN TO SCHOOL. 69

THE EVALUATION: REPEATED PREGNANCIES. 83

THE FUTURE 100

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 102

APPENDIX: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE. A-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Girl's Age.	12
2	Grade of School When Pregnancy Occurred	14
3	"Appropriate" Grade Level for Age	14
4	Grade Performance Before Pregnancy.	15
5	Family Size	16
6	Number of Children Under 12 Years	17
7	Girls' Marital Status and Living Arrangements	18
8	Girls' Length of Residence in Washington.	19
9	Mothers' Length of Residence in Washington.	20
10	Family Income Per Month	21
11	Per Capita Income Per Month	23
12	Job Characteristics of Main Earner.	24
13	Mothers' Employment Status.	25
14	Girls' Employment Status.	26
15	Occupational Prestige of Main Earners (Male and Female)	27
16	Girl's Report on Her Legitimacy	29
17	Reports by Girl of Friends and Relatives With Illegitimate Children.	30
18	Reported Postpartum Educational Continuity of Friends and Relatives Compared With the Study Group	32
19	Webster/Non-Webster Differences in Educational Continuity Compared With Their Friends and Relatives.	32

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table Page

20 The Fathers of the Babies 34

21 Age of the Baby's Father. 36

22 School Status of the Baby's Father. 37

23 Baby's Father's Schooling Compared With Girl's. 37

24 Girl's Marital Status at Time of Interview. 38

25 The Husband's Relationship to Webster Baby. 39

26 Fathers of Pregnancies at Time of Interview 39

27 Baby's Age at Interview 41

28 Location of Live Babies 42

29 When Girl Began Prenatal Care 43

30 Values on Child Care. 45

31 Responsibility for Child Care 47

32 Working Mothers and Girl's Responsibility for Child Care. 48

33 Who Has Most to Say About Raising the Baby. 48

34 Child Care and Who Has Most to Say About Raising the Baby. 49

35 Where the Girl First Heard of Webster 53

36 Who Cannot Attend Webster, According to the Non-Webster Girls 56

37 The Most Useful Thing Learned at Webster. 62

38 The Work of the Specialists 66

39 School Status Following the Baby's Birth. 71

40 Grade of School the Year of Pregnancy and Dropout Rates 72

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table Page

41 Timing of the Dropout 74

42 Socioeconomic Status and School Status. 75

43 The Importance of High School Graduation. 76

44 Values on School. 77

45 Environmental Factors in School Status. 78

46 Changes in Grade Performance. 80

47 The Jobs. 82

48 Additional Children 85

49 Grade of School and Additional Children 86

50 Socioeconomic Status and Additional Children. 87

51 Changes in Social Environment 88

52 Changes in Social Environment and Additional Children . 89

53 Family Composition and Additional Children. 90

54 Family Composition and Additional Children. 91

55 Size of Family and Additional Children. 94

56 When Girl Learned About Birth Control 95

57 Birth Control Techniques Used 97

58 Plans for the Fall of 1965. 100

59 Kind of School Planned for Fall 1965. 101

PREFATORY SUMMARY

Each year in Washington an increasing number of young women become pregnant while they are still in school. Since the early 1950's the number of illegitimate children born to nonwhite girls* under the age of 18 has been increasing, on the average, by approximately ten per cent a year.

In Washington, public school students who become pregnant are required to leave school once the pregnancy is discovered until their babies are born. It is frequently the case that the girl never returns to school following this hiatus in her education.

Concerned about this situation, as well as about probable needs for more systematic planning for the baby's future on the part of the girl and her family, local school officials established in 1963 a special program to provide a school in which a limited number of pregnant girls could continue to attend classes while they were pregnant. This was a demonstration program, sponsored by the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to offering regular academic course work, the program provided for the services of a special staff. The special staff included a psychologist, three psychiatric social workers, medical personnel, and a nutritionist. The specialists worked with the students on a variety of matters, including among others arrangements for child care, prenatal medical care, attitudes toward love and sexual behavior, and weight control and nutrition.

---

*In 1965, 88% of all girls enrolled in the public secondary schools were nonwhite.

Briefly stated, the objectives of the program were to demonstrate:

1. A multidisciplinary team approach to meeting the needs of pregnant school-age girls.

2. The feasibility of continuing the educational program for pregnant girls who otherwise would be compelled to drop out of school during pregnancy, and of providing for their medical, social and emotional needs.

3. The extent of participation by pregnant girls, who normally would be excused from school attendance during this period, in an organized group in which they might become publicly identified.

4. The extent of community acceptance of group instruction of pregnant girls by the public schools.

Demand for enrollment in the program was large, and the school was able to accommodate only about a fourth of the 541 girls who were referred for enrollment the first year of operation. In all, 142 girls attended the Webster school for varying lengths of time that first year.

In 1965 the Bureau of Social Science Research was engaged by the District Board of Education to conduct a study of Webster's first year of operations to examine the extent to which the program was accomplishing its goals, at least within the year or so since the babies' births.

Two basic evaluation criteria were selected for examination: the rate at which the girls returned to and continued with regular school following the baby's birth; and the frequency with which they bore additional children. The mode of evaluation used in the analysis was to compare the postdelivery experiences of the girls who went to Webster with those of a group of girls who were pregnant that year but did not attend the special school, and to ascribe differences between them to participation in the program. In addition, data were gathered on a variety of other factors which might also be expected to bear on the return to school and the production of more children, such as attitudes toward school, social networks and associations, knowledge and use of birth control techniques, and so forth.

The study design called for interviewing all the girls who attended Webster the first year and an equal number of girls of the same ages who were referred to the program but were not enrolled. Brief interviews were also conducted with an adult in the girl's home, when one was available (this was usually the girl's mother).

The mother's part of the interview covered such background characteristics as household composition, amount and sources of income, and occupations of workers in the family, as well as some attitudinal material (the interview schedule is appended to the report). The girls were asked about a wide range of topics, attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic, which are discussed in more detail below. Data were eventually collected from 109 Webster girls and 123 who were not able to participate in the program (the control group).

Although it was possible in this study to assess only the short-run effects of participation in the Webster program, the data indicate that attendance there did make a significant difference in whether a girl returned to and stayed in regular school. Attendance also made a significant difference in the likelihood that a girl would have become pregnant again in the time since the first baby was born. Thus, the data confirm the early impressions of the project staff that the program was "working." More detailed information on these and other points is presented below, and still more in the body of the report.

In the pages to follow, the findings are presented in generally chronological order, beginning with data on the girls' backgrounds and families, the process of getting to the Webster program, the experiences of those who went there, and what happened to them in the months following the baby's birth. Finally, the differences the Webster program made are explicitly examined.

To illustrate the findings, certain data were abstracted from the tables in the body of the report and are presented on the right-hand side of the page, separately for the Webster and control groups. It should be emphasized that what are summarized below are for the most part only some numbers from the tables. Very little of the reasoning behind the inclusion of the variables involved is presented here, nor is more than just a bit of discussion, speculation, and interpretation included. This fuller treatment of the data is, of course, available to the reader in the detailed report.

THE GIRLS: THEIR BACKGROUNDS AND CHARACTERISTICS

	Webster	Control
Half the girls were less than 16 years old when their babies were born; their ages ranged from less than 15 to over 18.		
Girl's age at baby's birth: 16 and under	76 %	73 %
More than half of each group were in junior high school the year they became pregnant, but the Webster girls were disproportionately concentrated in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades.		
Grade of school at pregnancy: 10th, 11th, 12th	45	34
	(P < .01)*	

---

*This denotes a statistically significant difference, measured by the chi-square, and states that the probability of this difference occurring by chance variation of the data was less than one in 100.

	Webster	**Control**
This seeming discrepancy in the data is explained by the tendency of the non-Webster girls to be more often behind their "appropriate" grade level, as judged by their ages.		
Grade level: behind level indicated by age	32 % (P <.01)	55 %
On the other hand, the non-Webster girls got better grades the year before they became pregnant than did the Webster group.		
Grade average: C or better	46 (P <.01)	65
Family Size and Composition		
Nearly three quarters of each group came from families with five or more members.	73	71
More than half of the families had two or more children under 12 years of age living with them.	56	61
The clear majority of the girls in each group were living in (at least part of) the family into which they had been born.	77	70
Among the 53 girls who were married at the time of the interview, the non-Webster girls were slightly more likely to have established a separate family with their husbands.		
Married: living separately with their husbands	40	55
The married Webster girls were more likely to be living together with their husbands in the home of the family of one of them.		
Among those living in their own family of origin, more than half lived in broken families.	52	53
Most of the broken families were headed by women.		
Eight in ten girls had lived all their lives in Washington. Nearly as many of their mothers had lived here for 20 years or more.		

Socioeconomic Status

	Webster		Control
According to several measures of socioeconomic status, the Webster families were in slightly better circumstances than the non-Webster families. They had a higher monthly family income.			
Family income: $600 or more per month	20 %		8 %
The Webster families also had a higher per capita monthly income than did the families of the control group.			
Per capita income: $80 or more per month	34	(P<.05)	21
The jobs held by the main wage earner in the Webster families were more likely to be regular and full-time, rather than sporadic and/or part-time.			
Jobs: regular and full-time	98	(P<.001)	83
The same proportion of families in each group had no income from earnings.	11		9
The mothers of the Webster girls were slightly more likely to be employed.	52		44
The same was true of the girls themselves.	17		11
Among the primary male wage earners, those of the Webster families held higher-prestige jobs than those of the non-Webster families.			
Job prestige: above over-all median (55)	49	(P<.01)	22
This was also the case among the primary female earners.			
Job prestige: above over-all median (55)	48	(P<.01)	24

To repeat in summary, the Webster families were consistently in a somewhat better socioeconomic position. These differences are statistically significant, but it should be noted at the same time that they are not numerically large, and that the families seem to belong to the same socioeconomic stratum (viewing the system as a whole), which might be termed "lower middle class."

Illegitimacy in the Environment

	Webster	Control
When they were asked whether, as far as they knew, their mothers were married at the time of the girl's birth, the Webster girls were less likely than the non-Webster girls to say that they were illegitimate.	7 % (P< .02)	18 %

Asked for information on friends and relatives who had borne illegitimate children, the girls described 365 such people, 80 per cent of whom were friends. The friends and relatives were not noticeably different from the girls in the age at which they had the baby, their marital status at the time of the interview, or their disposition of the baby.

The friends and relatives did differ from the girls in the study group in their experiences with the school system, however. The friends and relatives dropped out more often, although more of them graduated from high school (perhaps a function of their slightly greater age when the baby was born).

The difference is attributable to participation in the Webster program. The friends and relatives of the Webster girls dropped out of school following their pregnancy significantly more often (P< .001).

	Webster	Control
School status, Webster girls: dropouts	41	
School status, Webster friends and relatives: dropouts	63	

But the dropout rates were not significantly different for the girls in the control group and their friends and relatives (P< .05).

	Webster	Control
School status, control girls: dropouts		64
School status, control friends and relatives: dropouts		70

Moreover, it will be noted that the friends and relatives of the Webster girls are quite similar in this respect both to the non-Webster girls and to their friends and relatives. Thus, one effect of participation in the Webster program seems to have been to differentiate the girl from her peers in her relationship to the educational system.

The Baby's Father

Nearly all the girls had known the father of the baby for a year or more when they became pregnant. The Webster girls had known him slightly longer.

	Webster	Control
Had known the father for one year or more	92 %	83 %

Most of the couples met through mutual friends or at school.

Met through friends	40	34
Met at school	26	19

The baby's father was usually two or more years older than the girl. The Webster girls were slightly more likely to choose a boy within a year of their own age.

Father was within a year of girl's age	29	21

The majority of the fathers were school dropouts, although nearly four in ten had graduated from high school.

Father's school status: dropouts	53	60

In general, the fathers had had more formal education than had their girlfriends. This was the case to a greater extent among the non-Webster fathers than in the Webster group.

Father's education: greater than the girl's	46	66
	($P < .05$)	

About a quarter of the girls in each group had gotten married by the time of the interview. The Webster girls were more likely to wait until after the baby was born to marry, while the non-Webster girls married more often before or during the pregnancy.

Married following the baby's birth	81	61
	($P < .05$)	

	Webster	Control
When they married, the Webster girls were less likely to marry the baby's father.		
Husband was father of the baby	69 %	91 %
	$(P < .05)$	
Among those who were pregnant at the time of the interview, the Webster girls were the less likely to have been pregnant by the father of the first baby.		
Father of new baby was father of first baby	50	81
These last two findings suggest that one function of participation in the Webster program was that the girl was more likely to break off her relationship with the baby's father. This was confirmed by the answers to a question on how often the girl saw the baby's father, to which the Webster girls were slightly more likely to reply that they saw him no more than once a month, or never.		
Sees baby's father less than once a month or never	39	28
The Babies		
The babies were just over 16 months old on the average when the girls were interviewed. Nearly all of the babies who were alive were living with the girl.	91	95
Several of the pregnancies ended in miscarriage or stillbirth.	8	6
This cannot be attributed to a lack of prenatal care, since fetal deaths did not vary with presence or absence, nor with length, of prenatal attention.		
While nearly every girl received prenatal care, the Webster girls were more likely to start it before their fourth month of pregnancy.	85	59
	$(P < .001)$	

Those girls whose babies were living with them were asked about their involvement in caring for and raising their children: the relative importance of child care compared to other ways of spending the time; who had the most to say about raising the baby; and actual babysitting responsibilities. On the value level, there was no difference between the two groups of girls.

	Webster		**Control**
Babysitting is more important than going to school	22 %		26 %
Babysitting is more important than going to work	37		33

Consistently more of the non-Webster girls had responsibility for child care during each of five periods of the day, including the hours when they might have been attending school.

Girl has responsibility for child care in the:			
morning	42	($P < .05$)	57
afternoon	46	($P < .05$)	60
evening	56	($P < .05$)	71

And the Webster babies were more frequently cared for by someone other than the girl or her mother, leaving the girls even freer of this responsibility (sickness on the part of the mother would not be so disruptive, for example).

Child care by other than the girl or her mother in the:			
morning	40	($P < .05$)	25
afternoon	40	($P < .01$)	22

Whether or not a girl's mother worked made no difference in either group in the girl's babysitting responsibilities.

	Webster	Control

With respect to who "has the most to say about raising the baby," another (intermediate) value statement again there were no differences between the groups.

The girl has most to say about child-raising	60 %	65 %

Thus, the girl's babysitting behavior seems to vary independently of her expressed values. For example, child care responsibilities are not associated with who has most to say about raising the baby ($P > .05$) in either group of girls.

THE PROCESS OF GETTING TO WEBSTER AND WHAT HAPPENED THERE

Only a small number of girls said in the interview that they did not know of the existence of the Webster program. These were, obviously, all non-Webster girls.

Ignorant of the existence of the program		8

Among those who had some knowledge of the project, a parent, the school system, and the mass media were relatively more important sources of information on the school for Webster girls. For the non-Webster girls, a friend, a medical institution, and a social worker were relatively more important.

The non-Webster girls gave a variety of reasons why they did not attend the school. About a fifth said that they never considered enrolling, because they were more than four months pregnant at the time, they had no interest in school, they had made no plans for themselves at that time, they opted for maternity home care, and so forth.

Among those who considered going to Webster, the most frequent reason given for not doing so was that the school was overcrowded.

Perceptions of the School

Two-thirds of the non-Webster girls differentiated the Webster program in terms of the fact that all its students were pregnant. This exceptional circumstance aside, the great majority of girls described the program as one in which the students "study straight courses." Some knew that there was also special instruction in baby care.

When they were asked more specifically whether, as far as they knew, any pregnant girl could enroll in Webster, the most frequently-mentioned limitation on enrollment was the capacity of the program to accommodate the demand.

Whether or not she considered going to Webster, or actually did go, nearly every girl said that she thought a Webster-type program would be good for all school-age pregnant girls.

The Time at Webster

The Webster girls were enrolled in the program for a median of 18 weeks. All but 16 per cent stayed in school up until the time of delivery.

Among the reasons given for leaving Webster before the baby arrived, the one most often mentioned was illness and/or false labor.

When they were asked whether Webster seemed very different from regular school, about half said that it did not. The main ways in which Webster seemed different included (in descending frequency of mention) differences in the physical plant, the rules and regulations, and the general atmosphere and concern for the individual girl.

Nearly all the girls thought that they had done as well or better as students at Webster than they had before they became pregnant. This proved to be an overestimation on the part of many, at least as far as grades went.

	Webster	Control
Earned equal or better grade average at Webster	88 %	
Judged their relative grade averages accurately	36	

Among the various things the program participants learned at Webster, baby care was most often named as the single most useful thing, followed by academic subject matter and new perspectives on love and sexual behavior.

The girls were asked for their perceptions of the work of the special staff of the program. Among the wide variety of activities described for each of the specialists, the function(s) most frequently named were taken as the central component(s) of each of the roles as perceived.

The role of the social workers was centrally one of helping the girls with their personal problems. This was said to be a "very useful" function by a majority of the girls.

	Webster	**Control**
Social workers' work was very useful	76 %	

The psychologist had a dual role: giving tests; and talking to the girls and answering their questions. The test-giving function was understandably judged to be somewhat less useful than the counseling one.

The testing was very useful	40	
The counseling was very useful	65	

The nurse's job was perceived as that of teaching about baby care, which was rated very useful more than any other function. It will be remembered that, earlier, baby care was named as the single most useful thing learned in the program.

The baby care instruction was very useful	78	

Finally, the nutritionist's work was most often described as teaching the girls about maternity diets and nutrition in general.

The instruction on maternity diets was very useful	49	
The instruction on general nutrition was very useful	50	

THE EVALUATION: THE RETURN TO SCHOOL

There are distinct differences between the two groups in school status following the baby's birth. The Webster girls continued with regular school more, graduated more, and dropped out less than their non-Webster counterparts.

	Webster	Control
Dropped out of school	41 %	64 %
	(P $<$ .001)	

At every grade level, the non-Webster dropout rate was higher than that for Webster girls. The most vulnerable year for the Webster girls (i.e., the grade at which they were most likely to drop out) was the ninth grade; that for the non-Webster girls was the eighth grade. This reflects the approach to age 16 in each group (it will be remembered that the non-Webster girls were more likely to be behind their appropriate grade level).

Among the dropouts, the Webster girls were more likely to have returned to school following the baby's birth and then dropped out sometime later. The non-Webster girls typically dropped out at the time that their pregnancy was discovered and they were excused from school.

	Webster	Control
Dropouts: returned to regular school and then dropped out	73	28
	(P $<$ .001)	

In a search for alternative explanations for this distribution of the data, several additional variables were examined, including socioeconomic status, the girls' attitudes toward school, and their perceptions of the attitudes of their family and friends. It was found that although each of these factors contributed to some extent to the distribution of the data on the return to school, none was sufficiently influential to eliminate the factor of attendance at Webster entirely.

	Webster	Control
Although a girl's socioeconomic status had some independent association with her return to school, it was not a sufficiently strong association to account for the differentials in dropout rate between the groups.		
Large proportions of each group agreed that high school graduation is "more important than just about anything else a girl can do."		
In response to another question on educational values, upwards of three-quarters of the girls chose school over baby-sitting and over going to work. On neither measure of values did the two groups differ significantly.		
School is more important than babysitting	76 %	74 %
School is more important than going to work	91	82
High values on education were inversely related to dropout rates. The larger the number of interpersonal and institutional supports for staying in school that were available to a girl, the less likely she was to drop out.		
Those with maximum support: dropouts	24	44
Those with minimum support: dropouts	70 ($P < .01$)	77 ($P < .05$)
Among the girls who were attending regular school the full year after the baby was born (1964-1965), the majority maintained or raised their academic performance, as measured by grade averages. There is no difference between the Webster and control groups in this respect.	75	72
Among the few girls who went to work after the baby came, the Webster girls held jobs at higher skill levels.		

THE EVALUATION: ADDITIONAL CHILDREN

The Webster girls were significantly less likely than the non-Webster girls to have borne another child by the time of the interview. Nor were they as likely to have been pregnant when they were interviewed.

	Webster	**Control**
Those with another child	9 %	22 %
Those who were pregnant	19	31
	(P $<$.001)	

The junior high school girls in both groups contributed a disproportionate number of the additional children, although the differentials were not statistically significant. However, while Webster attendance generally lowered the chances of having another child, this effect was more noticeable among the junior high school girls.

More children, over-all	28	53
More children, junior high	37	59
More children, senior high	22	40

Again, a search was made for alternative explanations for the distribution of the repeated pregnancies, utilizing variables of socioeconomic status, changes in life patterns since the baby's birth, family size and composition, and knowledge and use of birth control techniques.

Socioeconomic status was not significantly associated with the production of additional children, although, as with the return to school, the data suggested that this factor was not without influence.

Maintenance of or change in such life patterns as leisure time activities and personal associations, including association with the first baby's father, had no significant association with whether or not the girl had had another child or was pregnant.

Only among the Webster girls did it make a difference whether the family was broken or intact. Among them, the chance of having another baby was lowered if they lived in a family with both parents present. The size of the family made no difference in a girl's chances of a repeated pregnancy.

Nearly all of the girls knew of one or more techniques of birth control. Most of those with this knowledge gained it only after the birth of the baby which brought them into contact with the Webster program.

The most frequently-used form of birth control used by the girls in each group was "the pill" (although there was scattered evidence that it was not being used correctly). The non-Webster girls placed slightly greater reliance on the pill, the Webster girls on vaginal foam.

Since no data were collected on the frequency and manner of utilization of birth control techniques, it was not possible to examine thoroughly what appeared to be a lack of any systematic relationship between knowledge and use of birth control and repeated pregnancy patterns.

THE FUTURE

With respect to what they expected to be doing in the fall of 1965 (that is, shortly following the time of the interview), the Webster girls were more likely to be planning to go to school or to combine school and work. The non-Webster girls expected to be going to school to a lesser extent, and nearly a quarter of them were planning to stay home.

	Webster	**Control**
Planned to go to school (and, sometimes, also work)	84 %	54 %
Planned to work full-time	13	19
Planned to stay home	2	22

($P < .001$)

	Webster	Control
Among those who planned to attend school, most expected to be attending regular public school (as opposed, for example, to a trade school).	82 %	81 %
The Webster girls were slightly more likely to plan to attend day school, the non-Webster girls to attend night school.		

INTRODUCTION

A Brief Background

Each year in Washington an increasing number of young women become pregnant while they are still attending school. In the 1963-1964 school year, for example, District Department of School attendance records showed that 347 girls 15 years of age and younger were pregnant, of whom most were probably unmarried. Since the early 1950's the number of illegitimate children born to nonwhite girls under the age of 18 has been increasing, on the average, by approximately ten per cent a year. And one estimate puts illegitimacy among girls under 18 at a magnitude of over 1,000 in 1965, to increase, "if not checked, to about 1,500 in a few years."[1]

In Washington, as in most cities, public school students who become pregnant are asked to leave school once their pregnancy is discovered, and they stay excused until after the delivery. A frequent result of the interruption of what may already be a tenuous attachment to the school system is that the girl in question never returns to school, or does so only with reluctance and correspondingly poor performance.

Concerned about this situation as well as about "the negligence in obtaining pre-natal care on the part of many . . . girls" and "the lack of adequate planning for the care and welfare of the babies,"[2]

---

[1] From an "Interim Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Girls' School," a document in the files of the public school system.

[2] From the first annual report of the program to be described below, "Report on a Multi-Disciplinary Approach to a School-Centered Rehabilitation Program for Pregnant School-Age Girls for the 1963-1964 School Year," which contains most of the information on which these background remarks rest.

District school officials established in 1963 a special program to provide a school in which a limited number of these girls could continue to attend classes while they were pregnant. It was funded by a three-year demonstration grant from the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Project D 130). Drawing on the experiences and resources of the school system, the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Public Welfare, the program was designed to demonstrate:

> 1. A multi-disciplinary team approach to meeting the needs of pregnant school-age girls
> 2. The feasibility of continuing the educational program for pregnant girls who otherwise would be compelled to drop out of school during pregnancy, and of providing for their medical, social and emotional needs
> 3. The extent of participation by pregnant girls, who normally would be excused from school attendance during this period, in an organized group in which they might become publicly identified
> 4. The extent of community acceptance of group instruction of pregnant girls by the public schools.[3]

The Organization of the Program

Going to the Webster school was in several respects quite similar to going to regular school. The girls attended classes in regular school hours, returning home at the end of the school day. The academic curriculum was like that prescribed for students in nonvocational junior and senior high schools in the city, and included such course offerings as English, algebra, history, typing, etc. (although it was necessary some of the time to combine grade levels of instruction, such as seventh and eighth grade English, or seventh, eighth, and ninth grade science). The girls were on the Webster rolls until delivery and for a few weeks following while they recovered, after which they presumably transferred back to regular school. For the most part, they transferred to a different school than the one they attended when they became pregnant, since all but one or two schools discouraged their reenrollment.

---

[3] *Ibid*.

There were at the same time, however, several respects in which the Webster program was quite different from that in regular school, notably in the work of the special program staff. In addition to the staff of a supervisor and teachers, the program utilized the full-time services of three psychiatric social workers and part-time services from a clinical psychologist, medical personnel, and a nutritionist were made available. These specialists' functions are described briefly below.

The social workers were to provide a variety of social services aimed at aiding the girl ". . . to work through and resolve the problems surrounding pregnancy, to guide her in making long range plans for the care of her baby, . . . and to facilitate her satisfactory transition from this program back to regular school."[4]

The psychologist was " . . . to supply the necessary psychological insights for the social workers, teachers and nurse, and to assist the girls in changing their social-sex attitudes through group sessions."[5]

The medical personnel gave informal instruction in prenatal physiology and general health practices, supervised the required regular prenatal care and referred the girls for other necessary medical care, offered classes on infant care, and organized a trip for some of the older girls to a maternity ward to familiarize them with the delivery procedure.

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

The nutritionist's work was not detailed in the annual report, but it seems to have been centered around instruction on maternity diets and weight control, child nutrition, and nutrition in general.

The program was housed on "the second floor of a school building which no longer housed children . . . located in the business area of the city."[6] It was estimated that this space could accommodate about 60 girls at any one time, and that a total of around 125 could be enrolled during the course of the school year. Anticipating that applications for admission would exceed the capacity of the program in the early limited experimental stages, formal selection priorities were established.

> Priorities . . . by which students are to be selected in the event that applications exceed capacity are as follows:
> 1. Those under 16[7] in the early months of pregnancy
> 2. All others under 16
> 3. Those 16 and over in [the] early stage[s] of pregnancy
> 4. Students needing junior and senior high school course completions for credit toward graduation
>
> No girls enrolled will be dropped because a girl of higher priority applies after capacity of the program is reached, but girls on the waiting list will be admitted according to the above priorities at the time a vacancy occurs.

In all, 142 girls were enrolled in the program in 1963-1964, and another 399 were referred but not enrolled.

---

[6] Ibid.

[7] The upper age limit of applicability of Washington compulsory school regulations.

The Evaluation

In 1965, the Bureau of Social Science Research was engaged by the District Board of Education to conduct a study of the Webster program's first year of operations to examine the extent to which it was accomplishing its goals, at least within the year or so since the babies' births. The program has many facets, of course, and not all of them could suitably be examined in a single study; and investigation even of selected aspects of the program could have been carried out in a variety of ways. In the necessary establishment of research priorities, two general evaluation criteria were designated for primary emphasis in measurement of the apparent effects of attendance at Webster: the frequency with which the girls returned to and continued with regular school following the baby's birth; and the frequency with which they became pregnant again within the period between the baby's birth and the time of the study. These particular areas of behavior were selected as the main points of the evaluation on the grounds that they are probably basic to the success of any other aspect of the program. Unless it can be shown that attendance at Webster is associated with modification of behavior in these areas, much of the reason for the program's existence disappears.

In addition to providing for gathering information on relationships between participation in the Webster program, the return to school, and the bearing of additional children, the study was designed to elicit data on various extra-Webster factors which might also be expected to bear on the same behavior. These include such attitudinal and environmental factors as the "social system of illegitimacy" from which the girls came, the attitudes of the girls and of those around them toward continuing in school, knowledge and use of birth control techniques, and so forth.

The Study Design

The study utilizes a quasi-experimental design, allowing for direct comparison of attitudes and behavior between the girls who attended the Webster school that first year and a similar group who were referred to the program but did not enter it. The plan was to interview all the girls who went to Webster and an equal number of girls, matched by age, who did not attend. (This second group is designated in the report as the "non-Webster" or control group.) Interviewers were assigned to each potential respondent to conduct an interview which lasted around an hour. The first and shorter portion of the interview was to be with the girl's (biological or sociological) mother or another older relative if the girl usually lived with that person. This part of the interview covered such matters as household composition, amount and sources of family income, and the mother's education, community activity, and length of residence in Washington. The rest of the interview was conducted with the girl herself and touched on a wide variety of topics, attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic, which will be presented in detail in the following pages. The interview schedule is appended to this report.

In addition to the data gathered in the interviews, information was obtained from official school records on the girls' academic performance and school status.

Location of the respondents proved to be a relatively difficult and time-consuming process because the address records from which assignments were made were as much as two years old. Comparing the two groups of girls, many more of the non-Webster girls could not be located, had moved without a forwarding address, or were listed at nonexistent addresses. Eventually, valid interviews were obtained from 109 Webster (77% of the total) and 123 non-Webster girls.[8]

Before proceeding to discussion of the study findings, it would be well to describe explicitly some of the limitations of this study. First, as suggested above, it does not allow for direct evaluation of each of the program goals. Specifically, there are no data with which to evaluate the effectiveness of the "multidisciplinary approach" used by Webster. Neither do the data allow for appraisal of public acceptance of the program beyond that of the individuals actually interviewed (which are part of, but probably not representative of, the public at large). Each of these questions would require a study of its own. The present study bears primarily on the educational continuity aspects of the Webster program, and its approach is from the point of view of the students who were (or might have been) its participants.

Time is another limiting factor. Most of the interviewing was done in August 1965, allowing a maximum of about 22 months for the girls to have established new patterns following the birth of the baby. Thus, any evaluation of the program is limited to an evaluation of its short run effects, and there is no way of telling what differences, if any, attendance at Webster eventually makes in a girl's life. A longitudinal study of the program using a panel design in which the girls were contacted at the time they were referred to Webster and followed through their pregnancy and for some time afterward, would not only be interesting, but would help to solve some of the problems inherent in the design adopted for this analysis, such as the necessity to rely on retrospection in responses, or the lack of data with which to judge what the long range implications of the program might be.

---

[8] A much higher proportion of the Webster group was located and interviewed than was the case with the original control sample. There were at least one and usually several replacements available for each of the non-Webster group, but none for the Webster girls. Only 31% of the original non-Webster sample were located and interviewed.

Further, this is not a study of pregnant school-age girls as such, since the group is probably an unrepresentative part of that larger group. The very fact that the girls sought to continue their education probably distinguished them from many pregnant girls of the same age, such as those who were not interested in school, or those from parts of the social system in which it is more common to approach the pregnancy as a problem in locating an abortionist, in securing entrance to a residential maternity home, or to take no particular action at all.

Another important thing missing in the study is some of the flavor of the experience, both for the girls and for the staff who designed and carried out the program. It is difficult to quantify (indeed, for respondents to express) the "pioneer spirit" discerned by some of the program staff, the sense of a "second chance" afforded the girls who were enrolled in the project, the excitement of experiment, and the many subtleties of response to the experience.

What the study does do is to provide a rather extensive body of data bearing on the lives, experiences, and attitudes of the girls who came in contact with the program--data which can serve as the basis for evaluation of certain important existent and potential effects of the role of the program in the community.

In assessing the findings on the effects of attendance at the Webster program, it is well to bear in mind just what might be expected in the way of effect. It would be unlikely, for example, that every Webster girl would return to regular school and stay there, and that none of the non-Webster girls would do so. Nor would it be reasonable to expect that no Webster girl but every non-Webster girl would have borne another child. There are several reasons why this would not be the expected situation. Perhaps the most important is that the hours spent at Webster accounted for only a portion of the girl's day, and while she might have been expected to carry some (or all) of what she learned at school home with her, the school was, nevertheless, only one of many sources of influence in her life. Some of these sources may have been supportive of the school's goals, but others probably were not. It will be seen that the majority of girls did not change their networks of social contacts following the baby's birth, for example (they continued to live at home during the pregnancy, they had the same friends, did the same things in their leisure time, and continued to see the father of the baby), and those networks were part of the environment in which the girl originally became pregnant. And just as the hours spent at school were only part of the day, the months the girls spent there represented only a small portion of their lives.

Another reason to expect these data to show less than absolute effect is that the period under study was the program's first year of operation, a period which necessarily involved trial and error, exploration, and "shaking down." While this is not intended to suggest that absolute effects would follow on accumulated experience, it is probable that with time certain increases in desirable effect might reasonably be expected. Indeed, this report is one factor in that accumulation of experience, and hopefully will provide a partial basis for consideration of the goals and direction of the program. It would also be important, at the same time, to validate (or refute) these findings by similar systematic examination of the characteristics and experiences of the participants in the program's second and third years. It is known, for example, that 57 per cent of the girls enrolled the second year were from high school, as contrasted with 45 per cent the first year. It would be important to know whether the second year's comparative dropout rate was lower than that for the first year, as would be suggested by the data presented in the report.

A final caveat: the Webster program has run the life of its demonstration grant, and will, starting in the fall of 1966, expand to approximately four times its original size, supported under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Thus, some of that which follows may be size- or time-tied in such a way as to be irrelevant to the project's future. Just how much or how serious this matter is cannot be judged now, but this change in the program should be kept in mind.

The Organization of the Report

The report of findings is organized in roughly chronological sequence, describing first the families from which the girls came, their personal and social characteristics, the process of getting to the Webster program, the experiences there of those who were enrolled, and what happened to the girls in the months following the baby's birth. Finally, the differences the Webster program seems to have made in the return to school and the production of additional children are explicitly examined.

In the report, the study group is usually broken into its Webster and non-Webster components. Much of the time this does not reflect the expectation that the two groups differ with respect to the variable under examination, such as family background. But this technique facilitates the identification of points at which the groups do differ, sometimes when they were not expected to.

Throughout the analysis the chi-square test has been used to evaluate the significance of differences and similarities between the two groups. The minimum acceptance level was set at five per cent probability that differences could be attributed to chance variation of the data. Thus, the phrase "no difference" means here "no statistically significant difference," even though there may be numerical differences to be observed. (It will be remembered that chi-square tests only for the existence of a nonchance relationship, and says nothing about the strength of the association.)

THE GIRLS: THEIR BACKGROUNDS AND CHARACTERISTICS

The girls, all but 3 or 4 of whom were Negroes, ranged from 13 years old to over 18; their median age was just over 16 when their babies were born (see Table 1). They were a somewhat younger group than all non-white mothers of illegitimate children in Washington in 1963: in the city as a whole, among those 19 years old and younger who bore illegitimate children that year, 7 per cent were less than 15 years of age, while 16 per cent of the study group were that young. (This is at least partly a function of Webster's selection priorities, which emphasized selection of girls in younger age groups.) Not all of the girls in the study group were unmarried, so that comparisons with illegitimacy rates for the city are not entirely valid. However, although about a fifth of each group married after the baby came, the great majority (92%) were unmarried at the time of the baby's birth.

TABLE 1

GIRL'S AGE
(In Percentages)

Age	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Less than 15	12	18
15	31	23
16	33	32
17	17	19
More than 18	6	3
Unknown	1	5
	100	100
Median	16-1/4 years	16-1/4 years

One characteristic of the girls in the study group which differentiated them from the population of all school-age mothers was the very fact that they attempted to continue their schooling while they were pregnant. This attribute of the girls becomes more significant when it is noted that over half of the study group were 16 years or older when the baby was born. A good number of these girls were probably close to or even over the compulsory school age at the time they became pregnant.

Most of the girls were in junior high school at the time their babies were conceived. Here, there is a difference between the Webster and non-Webster girls: while a little over half of those who went to Webster were in high school, only about a third of the other girls were that far along in school.[9] Thirty per cent of the Webster girls were in the eleventh and twelfth grades when they got pregnant, but only 16 per cent of the non-Webster girls. There was no difference in the median ages of the two groups, and the differences in their year of school is a reflection of a tendency for the non-Webster girls to be relatively farther behind their appropriate grade level, as judged by their ages.[10] Indeed, while 55 per cent of the non-Webster girls were behind, this was true of only 33 per cent of the Webster group.

---

[9] With a probability of less than one per cent that this difference is attributable to chance variation of the data.

[10] This is crudely measured by subtracting six from the girl's age to place her in her "appropriate" grade of school. While this would not be a satisfactory absolute measure of academic progress, it will serve adequately for purposes of comparison between the two groups.

TABLE 2

GRADE OF SCHOOL WHEN PREGNANCY OCCURRED
(In Percentages)

Grade	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
7th	6	11
8th	16	22
9th	23	31
10th	25	18
11th	16	9
12th	14	7
Unknown	-	2
	100	100

Break: Junior high/high: $x^2 = 8.6$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$.

TABLE 3

"APPROPRIATE" GRADE LEVEL FOR AGE
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=106)	Non-Webster (N=113)
At appropriate grade level	34	27
Above it	33	18
Below it	33	55
	100	100

Break: below/at or above: $x^2 = 10.7$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$

The differences in grade level and academic progress suggests that a factor may have been operating in the Webster selection process favoring the better students, a kind of "selection for success." On the other hand, when academic standing is measured by grade averages, the non-Webster girls received significantly better grades the school year before they became pregnant than did the Webster girls (although the four who had failing grades that year were all non-Webster girls). In view of the tendency for the non-Webster girls to be farther behind their appropriate class level, their better grade standing may have been partly a function of their greater maturity relative to the level of the work they were asked to do in school.

TABLE 4

GRADE PERFORMANCE BEFORE PREGNANCY
(In Percentages)

Grades	Webster (N=106)	Non-Webster (N=105)
C or better	46	65
Below C	54	35
	100	100

Break: C plus/below: $x^2 = 7.6$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$

All of the girls came from relatively large families. Comparison of the median family sizes of the two groups shows no difference between them: the Webster families contained a median of 6.0 persons, and the control families were only slightly larger.

TABLE 5

FAMILY SIZE
(In Percentages)

Number in Family	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
2-4	21	23
5-7	39	32
8-10	24	26
11-13	9	10
14 and over	1	3
Unknown	6	6
	100	100
Median	6	6.25

Nearly all the families had children under 12 years of age living with them. In a few families there were no youngsters, because the baby which brought the girl into contact with the Webster program (the Webster baby) had died or lived elsewhere, the girl had not had any additional children, and no one else in the household had a youngster living there.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 12 YEARS
(In Percentages)

Youngsters	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
None	5	3
One	33	30
2- 4	43	45
5- 7	12	14
8-10	1	2
Unknown	6	6
	100	100
Mean	2.6	2.8

Among those living in their own family of origin more than half lived in broken families. This is a considerably higher proportion than that which was characteristic for nonwhite families in the District as a whole in 1960, where both parents were present in 74 per cent of them. Most of the broken families were headed by women, usually the girl's mother (the comparable figure for Washington as a whole for 1960 was 21%).

Eighteen per cent of the Webster girls and 27 per cent of the control group were married and living with their husbands, some in separate families of their own, some in an extended family relationship (with the girl's family, or with the husband's family). Among the married group, Webster girls and their husbands were slightly (but not significantly) more likely to be living in an extended family situation, while the non-Webster girls were more likely to have established their own separate families with their husbands.

TABLE 7

GIRLS' MARITAL STATUS AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS
(In Percentages)

Status	Webster (N=109)		Non-Webster (N=123)	
Unmarried:				
In the family that raised her:		77		70
Both parents present	36		33	
Mother absent	1		2	
Father absent	36		33	
Both absent	4		2	
Married:				
In the family that raised her:		6		7
Both parents present	4		3	
Mother absent	-		1	
Father absent	2		2	
Both absent	-		1	
In her own separate family:		7		18
In her husband's family		5		2
Unknown Arrangement:		5		3
		100		100

The families were relatively long-term residents of Washington. The clear majority of the girls--eight out of ten, at least--were natives of the District. None of them had moved to Washington less than three years prior to the interviewing, although a very few had spent as much as a year with relatives in other parts of the country recently, while maintaining a base with the Washington members of their family. Around half of the girls or more in each group had lived in their neighborhood for more than five years. Here is one of the places where the procedure for locating respondents resulted in a biassing of the data, since the less stable families were missed in the interviewing. This is especially the case for the non-Webster girls. That there is no difference between the groups in length of residence is precisely because they are stable and could therefore be located either at the outdated address in the Webster records, or through friends or former neighbors.

Where information was available, at least a fifth to a third of the girls were daughters of a native of Washington, and a large proportion of the mothers had lived in the city for 20 years or more.

TABLE 8

GIRLS' LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN WASHINGTON
(In Percentages)

Residence	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Lifetime	81	80
Moved here from elsewhere	19	20
	100	100

TABLE 9

MOTHERS' LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN WASHINGTON (In Percentages)

	Webster (N=78)	Non-Webster (N=82)
3- 9 years	8	7
10-19 years	19	18
20 or more	73	75
	100	100
All her life[a]	36	21

[a] Some additional numbers of the mothers are probably Washington natives, but it is not possible to be sure just how many.

Measurement of the socio-economic status of the families in the study group was difficult, and there is some question about the reliability of the figures which were obtained. This was the case for several reasons, among them the circumstance that many of the respondents, all women, and the girls' mothers for the most part, simply did not know what others in the family earned at their jobs, if any. Further, although the majority of jobs were regular and full-time, some were part-time and/or sporadic, and it was not possible to take very systematically into account the effects of such factors as seasonality and the business cycle, although the respondents were asked to take a stab at the "average month." Another factor here is the relatively frequent change in patterns of income sources for families at the levels these appear to be, with chances that the family will be taken off or put onto public assistance, that the court-ordered support check may or may not arrive, and so forth. Nevertheless, the data which were gathered seem to make sense when they are put together with other information, and they are probably adequate for comparisons within the study group.

Data for several indicators of socio-economic status were gathered from the girls' mothers (or another adult where one was in the family). These included money income, job characteristics, and specific occupations of members of the family. To anticipate the conclusion to be drawn from the data, the families of the Webster girls were in a noticeably more favorable economic position than those of the non-Webster girls: they had higher incomes, better jobs, and less precarious sources of income in general.

The families of the study were neither the very poorest in the city nor in the higher reaches of the socio-economic system. Over-all, the median family income for the study group was near, though slightly below, the median for all nonwhite Washington families in 1960. (It should be remembered, though, that these families were larger than the average, so that per capita income is lower by a good deal.)

TABLE 10

FAMILY INCOME[a] PER MONTH
(In Percentages)

Income	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Up to $199	9	13
$200 - $399	38	40
$400 - $599	23	21
$600 and over	20	8
Unknown	10	18
	100	100
Median	$387	$342

[a] Respondents were asked to take into account seasonal and business fluctuations, and to report their income "in the average month."

Around a tenth of the families had no income from wages and salaries, but relied on public assistance, pension payments, and contributions from private welfare agencies and individuals. For around 10 per cent of the families, public assistance was the major single source of income; a few additional families counted public assistance as part, though not the majority, of their income. There was a (non-significant) tendency for the non-Webster families to rely more exclusively on public assistance for income: of the 15 families in the control group who received public assistance, this was the largest single source of income for two-thirds, but only for about half of the 19 Webster families who received public assistance.

Comparing the two groups of families, those of the Webster girls had significantly higher per capita incomes. The median for the Webster families was 29 per cent greater than that for non-Webster families. (The medians are group findings only, and have relatively little power to predict the position of any given family. Table 11 shows that the income distribution curves overlap to a large extent, so that some Webster girls are from families with considerably lower per capita income than those of some of the non-Webster girls. The medians are presented in order to illustrate the general economic levels from which the girls derived, not to suggest that all Webster girls were different in this respect from the non-Webster girls. The same caution applies to the comparative figures on median occupational prestige below.)

Sixty per cent of all families with the highest per capita monthly income ($90 or more) had children accepted by Webster whereas 60 per cent of the families with the lowest monthly per capita income (less than $20) were not accepted into the school. It is not altogether clear whether these figures indicate another selection bias in the Webster program. There may, in fact, have been a tendency for the program to select girls from families with relatively higher incomes. An alternative interpretation might be made, however, along the lines suggested in other studies: that increased income is associated with more awareness of facilities available in the community and knowledge about obtaining services. This could suggest the expectation that the better-off families were more persistent in their attempts to get their daughters enrolled in Webster. Persistence made an acknowledged difference in the chance for acceptance of any given girl, particularly as the demand began to exceed the school's capacity for students.

TABLE 11

PER CAPITA INCOME PER MONTH
(In Percentages)

Income	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Up to $19	2	2
$20 - $39	21	28
$40 - $59	13	17
$60 - $79	18	14
$80 and over	35	21
Unknown	11	18
	100	100
Median	$67.50	$52.20

Break: Above over-all median/below: $x^2 = 5.2$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$

Family income can of course be expected to be closely related to the jobs that produce it, and the data on these families are consistent with that expectation, which is an encouraging bit of evidence on the validity of the income data. The main earner (the individual with the highest income from employment) in the Webster families was more likely than his (or her) non-Webster counterpart to have a job which was full-time and regular. Although the majority of jobs in both groups were of this type, this was significantly more frequently the case among the Webster girls' families.

TABLE 12

JOB CHARACTERISTICS OF MAIN EARNER

Status	Webster		Non-Webster	
	Per Cent of Jobs (N=90)	Per Cent of Total (N=109)	Per Cent of Jobs (N=102)	Per Cent of Total (N=123)
Job				
Full-time, regular	98	81	83	69
Full-time, sporadic	1	1	9	7
Part-time, regular	1	1	5	4
Part-time, sporadic	-	-	3	2
Unknown		6		9
No Income From Wages		11		9
	100	100	100	100

Break: Full-time, regular/other: $x^2 = 11.4$; d.f. = 1; $P < .001$

Most of the families had more than one wage earner; this was true of 62 per cent of the Webster and 57 per cent of the control families. Most of the second jobs were also regular and full-time.

About a fourth of the families had no male wage earner, and were dependent on the earnings of one or more women (some of them the girls themselves). Looking just at working mothers, slightly more mothers of Webster than of non-Webster girls worked outside the home. The same pattern obtains among the girls: slightly more Webster than non-Webster girls worked outside the home.

TABLE 13

MOTHERS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(In Percentages)

Employment	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
At home[a]	1	2
Outside home	52	44
None	30	29
Not applicable[b]	10	15
Unknown	7	10
	100	100

[a] Includes employment such as babysitting in own home.

[b] Girl does not live with mother, or there is no mother or substitute in the home.

TABLE 14

GIRLS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(In Percentages)

Employment	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
At home	-	1
Outside home	17	11
None	76	79
Unknown	7	9
	100	100

The occupations of the main male earner and the main female earner (where there was either or both in the family) were classified according to their occupational prestige.[11] Once again, the families of the Webster girls as a group were in a better position than those in the control group. Although the men and women within each group held jobs at roughly the same prestige level, the Webster men had higher-prestige jobs on the average than did the non-Webster men and more were in the highest prestige category. The same was true of the women in the two groups.

---

[11] Using Reiss' modification of the North-Hatt occupational prestige scale (A. J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status [New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961]), which predicts general proportions who would rate a given occupation as "good" or "excellent" based on the education and income of the occupant of the job and projecting onto prestige rankings obtained by actual interview studies on limited numbers of occupations. Although there are some reservations on the validity of the scale at lower levels of the socioeconomic range, it is nevertheless a useful descriptive tool. Some representative occupations at selected prestige levels: construction laborer (43), construction operative (57), hospital attendant (52), counter and fountain worker (56), painter (56), laundry and dry-cleaning operative (54), stenographer, typist, secretary (74), retail trade sales clerk (67), auto mechanic (58), truck driver (54), private household worker, living out (42), charwoman and cleaner (48).

TABLE 15

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE OF MAIN EARNERS (MALE AND FEMALE)
(In Percentages)

	Men		Women	
	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Prestige Level:				
Up to 39	2	2	1	-
40 - 59	31	42	31	44
60 and over	29	12	30	14
Cannot Rank Job	-	3	4	-
No Earner	23	24	20	25
No Wage Income	9	7	9	9
Job Unknown	6	10	5	8
	100	100	100	100
Median	58	54	58	53

Break (Men): Above over-all median/below: $x^2 = 10.4$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$
Break (Women): Above over-all median/ below: $x^2 = 8.2$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$

In summary, then, and to repeat the earlier statement, the families of the Webster girls were consistently in a better socioeconomic position than those of the girls who did not attend the school. They had more stable employment, in jobs of higher standing, and the larger incomes which would expectedly be associated with those characteristics. It should be pointed out that, although these differences are statistically significant, the variations are not really so great when they are compared with data for the larger community. The study group showed internal similarities (such as relatively low income) which distinguished it, even though there were differences within it. Thus, a more accurate phrasing of the relative socioeconomic positions of the two groups of families might be that "the Webster families were consistently in a little better situation."

Illegitimacy in the Environment

Several items in the interview schedule yielded information on the "environment of illegitimacy" in which the girls lived. These included questions on the girl's perception of her own illegitimacy and of the experiences of her friends and relatives with pregnancies when they were unmarried.

Although most of the girls in each group reported that they thought they had been born legitimately, the non-Webster girls were significantly more likely to say that their mothers had not been married when they were born. This difference could be interpreted in several ways. It may be that the Webster respondents were more inclined to give the respectable answer to the question. They were, after all, not only from somewhat higher socioeconomic levels, but they had been through the Webster program, where they were directly confronted with the norm that illegitimacy is a "bad thing," and to be avoided. Or, it may be that the Webster girls' mothers themselves encouraged the notion that the girls were legitimate. (The question asked for the girl's perception of the situation; she could not know whether her mother was married when she was born.) Or it may simply be that pregnant illegitimate girls were in fact not as successful at getting into Webster, though this seems unlikely. At any rate, it should not be lost that 83 per cent of all the girls said they thought that they were legitimate.

TABLE 16

GIRL'S REPORT ON HER LEGITIMACY
(In Percentages)

Legitimacy	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=122)
Mother married at girl's birth	88	80
Mother unmarried at girl's birth	7	18
Marital status unknown	5	2
	100	100

Break: Married/unmarried: $x^2 = 5.6$; d.f. = 1; $P < .02$

Most of the girls were younger when they had their first child than their mothers had been with their first children. Only a few of the girls' mothers were younger than their daughters when they started their childbearing.

One implication of these data on the relative ages of the girls and their mothers at first birth and the girl's perceived legitimacy status is that they raise questions about the not-unknown assertion that the behavior pattern of young illegitimate pregnancy is cyclical or is perpetuated along lines of descent (the bad-daughters-of-bad-mothers approach). At least in this group, this did not appear to be the case.

When the girls were asked about friends and relatives who had had illegitimate children, close to a fifth of each group said that they did not know of anyone who had been in this predicament. The non-Webster girls were slightly more likely to say this, which may raise a question about the suggestion that Webster girls might have been more prone to the respectable response. The 182 girls who did know of someone who had had children "when they weren't married" gave information on 365 such relatives and friends.

TABLE 17

REPORTS BY GIRL OF FRIENDS AND RELATIVES WITH ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

	Webster	Non-Webster
Relationship to Girl	(N=187)	(N=178)
Relative	20	20
Friend	80	80
	100	100
Age	(N=184)	(N=171)
Younger than girl	18	19
Same as girl	28	26
Older than girl	54	55
	100	100
Marital Status[a]	(N=184)	(N=173)
Same as girl	64	71
Different from girl	36	29
	100	100
Disposition of Baby	(N=136)	(N=141)
Same as girl	79	87
Different from girl	21	13
	100	100

[a] This refers to marital status at the time of interview.

In some respects, the girls and their relatives and friends were similar: they had the same marital statuses most of the time, and (where the information was available) usually made the same disposition of the baby. But these similarities are neither surprising nor particularly important. Negro mothers of illegitimate children most often keep their children with them, partly because adoption opportunities are so limited for these babies. And there is no reason to expect that the friends or relatives should have married or not married in differen patterns than the girls in the study group. In other words, these similarities of experience may say less about the influence of friends and relatives on the girl's behavior than about the histories of Negro mothers of illegitimate children in general.

The experiences of the friends and relatives with the school system (as reported by the girls) were both less favorable than those of the study group (more of the former were school dropouts) and more favorable (more graduated from high school). Considerably fewer of the nongraduates were reported to have continued their schooling after the baby was born. Since the friends and relatives were frequently older than the girls when the baby was born, and hence by age alone more likely to be high school graduates, those who continued school and those who graduated were combined and compared with those who dropped out. The proportions in each of these categories did not differ for the friends and relatives of the girls in each group, and whatever differences emerge between girls in the study group and their friends and relatives will be a reflection of the experiences with the educational system on the part of the study group. It can

TABLE 18

REPORTED POSTPARTUM EDUCATIONAL CONTINUITY OF FRIENDS AND RELATIVES COMPARED WITH THE STUDY GROUP (In Percentages)

School Status	Study Group (N=231)	Friends and Relatives (N=272)
Dropped out	53	66
Continued	32	9
Graduated	15	25
	100	100

be seen from Table 19 that the Webster girls differed significantly from their friends and relatives, but that this was not so among the non-Webster girls. Thus, to anticipate a finding to be discussed in more detail below, the Webster experience apparently functioned to differentiate a girl from some of her peers with respect to at least this aspect of her relationship to the school system.

TABLE 19

WEBSTER/NON-WEBSTER DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATIONAL CONTINUITY COMPARED WITH THEIR FRIENDS AND RELATIVES (In Percentages)

School Status	Webster		Non-Webster	
	Girls (N=109)	Friends and Relatives (N=137)	Girls (N=123)	Friends and Relatives (N=135)
Dropped out	41	63	64	70
In school, graduated	59	37	36	30
	100	100	100	100
	$x^2=11.1$; d.f.=1; $P < .001$		$x^2=1.2$; d.f.=1; $P > .05$	

The Babies' Fathers

Most of the girls had known the baby's father for at least a year at the time they became pregnant, and a few had known him for seven years or more. Fewer than a sixth had known him for a relatively short time. These data do not very greatly from those of other studies, although the categories of length of time, the specific information asked for, and the respondents included are different in some respects. Sauber and Rubenstein[12] found that 89 per cent of their respondents (which included some whites and Puerto Ricans) had known the baby's father for at least a year prior to the pregnancy. And Bowerman[13] found that

> . . .The vast majority of women had at some time gone with their sex partners exclusively. . . . More than one-third of the Negroes had associated with the alleged father to the exclusion of other contacts for more than two years before they had become pregnant. . . . About one-quarter of the Negro women had associated with the alleged father exclusively for fewer than six months or never.

The channel through which the girls and their boyfriends most frequently met was that of mutual friends. Friends and parties accounted for the means of acquaintance for over half of the couples in each group. Next most important as a meeting place was school. For the Webster girls, school as a meeting place was named slightly more often than it was by the control group, and so were friends. The non-Webster couples met relatively more often at a party or because of their physical proximity (they lived in the same house or next door to one another, for instance).

---

[12] M. Sauber and E. Rubenstein, Experiences of the Unwed Mother as a Parent (Community Council of Greater New York, 1965), p. 55.

[13] C. E. Bowerman, D. P. Irish, and H. Pope, Unwed Motherhood: Personal and Social Consequences (mimeo, 1963), p. 97.

TABLE 20

THE FATHERS OF THE BABIES
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
How Long the Girl Had Known Him:		
Less than 1 month	-	2
One month up to one year	8	13
1 - 3 years	73	66
4 - 6 years	14	15
7 or more years	5	2
Unknown	-	2
	100	100
Where They Met:		
Through friends	40	34
At school	26	19
In proximity	11	15
At a party	10	14
On the street	7	7
Through the family	4	7
At church	1	1
Unknown	1	3
	100	100

The importance of these differentials is that they shed some light on certain questions about the "legitimation" or interpersonal support for the relationship, which, unfortunately, was not examined systematically in this study. But other research has raised the issue of whether couples whose relationship results in an illegitimate pregnancy tend characteristically to be generally isolated from peers and family, who might encourage constraints on the couple's behavior, or at least subject it to some scrutiny (in other words, to structure into the situation some limits on behavior). Bowerman, for example, investigating "the extent to which the alleged father-unwed mother relationship was subject to the social constraints of family, friends, and home town," found that

> ". . .Only a minority of women have an affair that results in unwed motherhood while they are in isolation from their normal social environment. . . . The significance of these facts is that the relationship leading to pregnancy did not take place apart from the customary sources of social control, and if these agencies attempted to exert any control, it was not effective for these girls.[14]

(Of course, as Bowerman observes, neither his study nor the present one have the benefit of comparative data on the social networks of girls who did not get pregnant.)

Although data bearing directly on this question were not gathered, it may be useful to note that, at least at the point of meeting, the couples were more frequently acting in the company of friends and relatives than they were in situations where they were relatively less visible to scrutiny, such as those represented by meetings on the street, at a playground, or around the neighborhood (although, obviously, friends can encourage a couple to behave in such a way as to risk producing a child). These speculations are peripheral to the direct concerns of this study, and, in view of the lack of information on the continuing relationship, ought to be taken with considerable caution. The matter might constitute part of another study.

---

[14] Bowerman, _et al_., _Ibid_, pp. 92, 94-95.

The babies' fathers were for the most part two or more years older than the girls. About a quarter of the fathers in each group were four or more years older. The differences were not significant, but the Webster girls tended to choose boys their own age (within a year), while the non-Webster girls chose somewhat older boys.

TABLE 21

AGE OF THE BABY'S FATHER
(In Percentages)

Age	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
4 or more years older than the girl	24	28
2 - 3 years older	41	46
The same age	29	21
2 - 3 years younger	4	2
Unknown	2	3
	100	100

As far as the girls knew, a little over half of the fathers had dropped out of school. Upwards of a third were high school graduates, while a few were still in school. (There is no way to evaluate this dropout rate to see whether fatherhood affects the boy's chances of finishing school, since data on general dropout rates among Negro boys in the Washington schools were not available for this study.)

TABLE 22

SCHOOL STATUS OF THE BABY'S FATHER
(In Percentages)

School Status	Webster (N=77)	Non-Webster (N=89)
Dropped out	53	60
In school	8	4
Graduated	39	36
	100	100

In general, where information was available, the fathers appeared to have had more schooling than their girlfriends. The relatively smaller proportion of Webster fathers with more schooling than the girl may be due to the tendency for the Webster girls to be more concentrated in the higher grades. That is, there may be a ceiling effect operating here: as a girl gets more toward the top of the range, the sheer arithmetical chances for her boyfriend to be farther along decrease.

TABLE 23

BABY'S FATHER'S SCHOOLING COMPARED WITH GIRL'S
(In Percentages)

Father's Schooling	Webster (N=68)	Non-Webster (N=74)
Greater than the girl's	46	66
The same	26	23
Less than the girl's	28	11
	100	100

Break: Greater/same or less: $x^2 = 4.0$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$

Around a fourth of the girls were married at the time of the interview. Most of the marriages in each group took place after the baby's birth, but the Webster girls were significantly more likely to wait until then to marry.

TABLE 24

GIRL'S MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
(In Percentages)

Marital Status	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Unmarried	76	71
Married		
Before pregnancy	-	2
During pregnancy	4	9
After delivery	20	18
	100	100

Break: Married before, during/after: $x^2 = 5.1$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$

When they did marry, the Webster girls were significantly less likely than the non-Webster girls to marry the baby's father. Furthermore, among those who were pregnant at the time of the interview, the non-Webster girls were more likely (but not significantly so) to be pregnant for the second time by the father of the Webster baby. It would appear, then, to report it somewhat out of place, that one result of participation in the Webster program was to decrease the likelihood that the girl would continue to associate with the father of her first child,

TABLE 25

THE HUSBAND'S RELATIONSHIP TO WEBSTER BABY
(In Percentages)

Husband Is:	Webster (N=26)	Non-Webster (N=35)
Baby's father	69	91
Another man	31	9
	100	100

$x^2 = 4.0$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$

TABLE 26

FATHERS OF PREGNANCIES AT TIME OF INTERVIEW
(In Percentages)

Father Was:	Webster (N=10)	Non-Webster (N=27)
That of first baby	50	81
Another man	50	19
	100	100

at least to the point of an involvement leading to marriage or to another child. Just who broke off the original relationship between them is not known, but it could have some bearing on an evaluation of the effects of the Webster program. There was an effort made on the part of the school to encourage the father's participation in the pregnancy, by involving him in plans for the baby's living arrangements, discussion groups, and so on. And his family sometimes got directly involved, as well, even to the extent in a few cases of taking the baby to live with them. It might be conjectured that the relationship between the girl and the baby's father dissolved under the pressure on the father for his involvement, while the relatively lesser pressure for participation among the non-Webster fathers allowed the relationship to continue.[15] On the other hand, if a continued relationship of the couple, with whatever things may go along with it, also results in repeated pregnancies, a breakoff may be preferable. However, data from this study suggest that the opposite is the case: among those who continued to see the baby's father at the time of the interview, 36 per cent had had another child or were pregnant; this was the case with 43 per cent of the girls who did not continue their relationship with the baby's father.

The Babies

At the time the girls were interviewed, the median age of the babies was just over 16 months. Nearly all of them were living with the girl in her home. This compares with Bowerman's figure for Negro mothers of a first illegitimate child, of whom 95 per cent had their babies at home with them.[16] However, Bowerman's group included residents of rural areas and of a different age range than this study group. It might be expected that urban mothers would be somewhat less likely than the rural ones to keep the baby, since they have more, though still limited in the case of Negroes, adoption opportunities. Mothers of greater age, on the other hand, would be more likely than younger ones to keep the baby, partly because of greater basic economic independence. It is not known to what extent these influences cancel out, or how comparable Bowerman's data really are to those of the Webster study.

---

[15] This smacks of an "irresponsible" version of the fathers, but could very well be operating, especially among younger, poorer, first-time fathers. What little study there has been of the "illegitimate father" suggests that his uninvolvement is frequently the case.

[16] Bowerman, op. cit., Table 10, p. 84.

TABLE 27

BABY'S AGE AT INTERVIEW
(In Percentages)

Age	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=123)
Up to 12 months	7	12
12 - 13 months	17	13
14 - 15 months	8	16
16 - 17 months	25	22
18 - 19 months	20	19
20 or more months	14	10
Baby deceased	9	6
Unknown	-	2
	100	100
Median	16.5 months	16.3 months

TABLE 28

LOCATION OF LIVE BABIES
(In Percentages)

Location	Webster (N=100)	Non-Webster (N=115)
With girl	91	95
With a relative	6	2
Adopted	1	2
In an institution	-	1
With its father	2	-
	100	100

About seven per cent of the babies were miscarried or stillborn.[17] This relatively high rate (and here it is assumed that it is not simply an accident that so many were reported dead, that the figure is valid) is difficult to explain when it is observed that nearly every girl received regular prenatal care while she was pregnant, and that she started getting this care when she was (a median of) not quite four months pregnant. The girls whose babies died got as many months of regular prenatal care as girls whose babies did not die. Or, it may be that this death rate is not extraordinarily high at all for girls of this age and natality group. Bowerman found a rate of four per cent for Negroes having their first child, for example.

---

[17] Statisticians in the Department of Public Health have advised that this rate cannot validly be compared with the rate for nonwhites in the District as a whole (which was considerably below the 7% level in 1963), because of certain reporting peculiarities which operate to underestimate actual fetal death rates, and because of nonrandom distribution of fetal deaths within the city, in part.

The proportion of girls who did receive prenatal care is greater than that for their age peers in Washington as a whole, where only 79 per cent of nonwhites had this treatment in 1963. Apparently, the practice followed at Webster of urging each person referred to obtain prenatal medical attention had an effect here. Webster's requirement for regular prenatal appointments[18] probably partially accounts for the significantly greater likelihood for the Webster girls to have started prenatal care before their fifth month of pregnancy.

TABLE 29

WHEN GIRL BEGAN PRENATAL CARE
(In Percentages)

Girl Was:	Webster (N=108)	Non-Webster (N=117)
1 - 2 months pregnant	21	17
3 - 4 months pregnant	64	42
5 - 6 months pregnant	14	33
7 or more months pregnant	1	8
	100	100
Median	3.5 months	3.8 months

Break: Up to four months/over: $x^2 = 19.7$; d.f. = 1; $P < .001$

---

[18] "Medical appointments were considered to be an integral part of each student's program." From the program's first annual report.

Nearly half the girls had had another baby and/or were pregnant at the time of interview; a few additional ones had been pregnant but lost the baby before they were interviewed. Among those who were pregnant, nearly three-quarters were so by the father of the first child. More will be said below on the matter of subsequent pregnancies.

The girls who had their babies living with them were asked about their child-care arrangements. This matter is of interest if only because a girl who cannot find a babysitter cannot go to school. Or, on another level, if the girl cannot make a kind of abdication of her motherhood, by leaving child care and child raising to others (which is what happens, for example, when the baby is cared for and sometimes raised by the girl's mother), it will be more difficult for her to assume such nonadult roles as "student." Leaving the care and raising of the baby to others probably functions much as a form of adoption, in freeing the mother to go about her previous business if she desires to do so--in this case, going to school, or, more broadly, being an adolescent.

In order to get at this matter, the girls were asked who "usually" took care of the baby during various parts of the day, who had "the most to say about raising the baby," and whether staying home to babysit "would be more important" than finishing high school or working to earn money. These constitute measures of the girl's values with respect to child raising as well as of her behavior in this area.[19]

---

[19] The data are not so direct as this statement suggests, unfortunately. The fact that others "usually" cared for the baby, for example, does not necessarily imply the girl's abdication of the mother role. Also, the value questions were asked in the context of the girl's attitudes about the importance of finishing school, not in that of child raising. But the data may be suggestive.

On the value level, around a fourth felt that staying home to take care of the baby was more important than finishing high school, and a somewhat larger proportion said that baby care was more important than going to work. The Webster girls were slightly the more likely to choose baby care over working, slightly the less likely to choose babysitting over going to school. Differences aside, it is striking that such large proportions of each group opted away from child care for school and for working. This would appear to be rather general abdication of at least this part of the mother role on a value level.

TABLE 30

VALUES ON CHILD CARE
(In Percentages)

Girl Chose:	Webster (N=95)	Non-Webster (N=108)
School over baby	76	74
Baby over school	22	26
Cannot choose	2	-
	100	100
Work over baby	62	66
Baby over work	37	33
Cannot choose	1	1
	100	100

Behaviorally, somewhat larger proportions of each group had some involvement in caring for their children. The following table shows the proportions of each group who had at least some responsibility for child care during various segments of the day.[20] During the morning, afternoon, and evening, hours in which a girl could attend regular or evening school, the Webster girls were significantly less likely to have had responsibility for babysitting. It appears that the Webster girls had been able to make better arrangements for the care of the baby, although this may again have been a function of the relatively higher economic position of the girls in this group. (It is likely also to reflect the efforts of the Webster social workers to help the family to arrange for child care with a view to leaving the girl relatively free of this responsibility.) Indeed, in the mornings and afternoons, 40 per cent of the Webster girls' babies were cared for by someone besides the girls or their mothers, while this was true for only a quarter or less of the non-Webster girls' children. Some of the others who babysat were relatives, who may or may not have charged for their time, but between 36 and 40 per cent of them were not relatives, who presumably did charge for the child care. At any rate, the Webster girls did seem to be freer of child care responsibilities than was the case among the non-Webster girls.

---

[20] Two cautions: if a girl reported that she usually took care of the baby, it did not always mean that she was the only one who usually did so--she sometimes shared this with another person, most often her mother. Second, the interviewing was carried out during the summer, and the "usually" to which the girl referred may have stated the condition during the summer months, rather than throughout the year, and thus have resulted in an overstatement of her involvement.

TABLE 31

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE

Part of the Day	Webster (N=91)[a]		Non-Webster (N=110)[a]	
	Proportion Cared For:		Proportion Cared For:	
	By Girl Herself	By Other Person[b]	By Girl Herself	By Other Person[b]
Early morning	53	25	67	12
Morning	42	40	57[c]	25[d]
Afternoon	46	40	60[e]	22[f]
Evening	56	24	71[g]	18
Late at night	66	9	74	8

[a] Those whose babies live with them only.

[b] Someone other than the girl or her mother.

[c] $x^2 = 5.2$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$.

[d] $x^2 = 4.4$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$.

[e] $x^2 = 4.3$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$.

[f] $x^2 = 7.9$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$.

[g] $x^2 = 4.3$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$.

It was thought that whether or not the girl's mother worked might have an influence on the girl's babysitting responsibilities, but there was no difference between the Webster and non-Webster groups in this respect, nor did it make a difference within each group.

TABLE 32

WORKING MOTHERS AND GIRL'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD CARE

Part of the Day	Proportion With Responsibility: Webster		Non-Webster	
	Mother Works	Mother Does Not Work	Mother Works	Mother Does Not Work
Morning	(N=50) 38	(N=32) 31	(N=49) 55	(N=35) 60
Afternoon	(N=53) 42	(N=35) 34	(N=47) 61	(N=35) 63

Moderate and similar proportions of the girls in each group said that they themselves usually had "the most to say about raising the baby" rather than someone else, such as a mother, husband, father, etc. When these responses were compared with those on the girl's actual participation in child care (Table 34), there was only a slight (not significant) tendency to association. (This table is percentaged both ways, since it is not known just which way the association runs, whether the girl had most to say about raising the baby because she took care of it [Table 34A] or whether she took care of the baby because she had most to say about raising it [Table 34B].)

TABLE 33

WHO HAS MOST TO SAY ABOUT RAISING THE BABY
(In Percentages)

Most to Say:	Webster (N=91)	Non-Webster (N=109)
Girl	60	65
Mother	33	27
Someone else	7	8
	100	100

TABLE 34

CHILD CARE AND WHO HAS MOST TO SAY ABOUT RAISING THE BABY[a]

	Webster		Non-Webster	
	Girl	Other	Girl	Other
A. Responsibility as Independent Variable:	(N=38)	(N=50)	(N=64)	(N=40)
Most to Say:				
Girl	66	52	70	55
Other	34	48	30	45
	100	100	100	100
	$x^2 = 1.7$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$		$x^2 = 2.8$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$	
B. Most to Say as Independent Variable:	(N=51)	(N=37)	(N=67)	(N=37)
Child Care:				
Girl	49	35	67	51
Other	51	65	33	49
	100	100	100	100

[a] Combining morning and afternoon child care arrangements.

In summary, then, the girls were considerably less involved with childraising on the value level than when it came to their reported actual behavior. That this should be the case is not surprising, since these are young women who may feel that they have been thrust into adult roles early, who are at the same time faced with the reality of providing for the care of a child in what frequently were confining economic circumstances. When the girl was asked about her wishes (or values) she could afford to opt away from babysitting, but this was bound to be less easy to put into practice.

These remarks should not be taken to suggest that the girls were uninvolved in the sense that they did not care about the baby or that they were ignoring the fact of their motherhood. There are no data in this study bearing on these issues, but other studies have shown that among women who keep their illegitimate children there is usually anything but a lack of concern for the child. Indeed, even granting that adoption outlets for Negro babies in Washington are limited, the fact that the girl had the baby living with her may be interpreted as involvement with the child on her part. It is to be noted that when the girls' mothers were asked what they thought the girls should do when the discovery of the pregnancy was made, only six mentioned that they had thought about advising adoption. And some of the girls who had not attended school in 1964-1965 because of babysitting responsibilities said that they preferred to stay home with the baby. In any event, the observations on "involvement" above operate advantageously from the point of view of a school system, since if the girls were more "involved" they would be that much less likely to return to school.[21]

---

[21] The issue of school dropouts is, of course, much more complex than this; it will be discussed in greater detail below.

There are several other kinds of information on the girls, their children, and school, which will be reserved for discussion below, since they are more properly examined in the context of the possible effects of participation in the Webster program than as descriptive background materials. Before moving to the evaluation, however, it is necessary to examine briefly the process of coming into contact with the Webster program, and what happened in the program to the girls who were enrolled there.

THE PROCESS OF GETTING TO WEBSTER AND WHAT HAPPENED THERE

Only a small number of girls said in the interview that they did not know of the existence of the Webster program. They were, obviously, all non-Webster girls. It is entirely possible for some not to have known of the program, since "referral" sometimes involved nothing more than a telephone call of inquiry by a parent, or someone else other than the girl, which was never carried any farther (after, for example, the inquirer had to be told that the program was overcrowded). At the time of the discovery of the girl's pregnancy more than half of the girls' mothers did not know of the school, which is hardly surprising since that was the first year of Webster's operation. What is more to the point is that at the time of the interview a few of the mothers still did not know of it.[22]

Among the girls who did know of the program, the single most frequent source of their information was a friend; a third of the respondents mentioned this. Eighteen per cent of those friends had themselves attended Webster. The second most important source of information mentioned was school system personnel. These are the sources the girls remember best, presumably, as much as nearly two years after the event, and may not reflect accurately the actual very first source from which they heard about the school. One might expect larger proportions naming clinic personnel than actually showed up, for example, in view of their strategic location with respect both to pregnant girls in general and to the program. (It will be remembered that one of the Webster psychiatric social workers was stationed in a clinic which provides prenatal care for large numbers of the city's pregnant.) What these data probably do reflect, however, is the most salient source of information about the school for the girls.

---

[22] In order to avoid the difficulties of possible confusion resulting from calling the school by name, the question did not ask for knowledge only of "the Webster program," but included a short statement that that was the program where pregnant girls could keep on going to classes.

TABLE 35

WHERE THE GIRL FIRST HEARD OF WEBSTER
(In Percentages)

Source of Information	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=114)
A parent	16	3
Another relative	5	3
A friend	21	44
The school system	23	15
Medical personnel	10	17
A social worker	6	12
The mass media	17	3
Other, unspecified	2	3
	100	100

Although there are no differences between the two groups in type of information source--around half of them were interpersonal contacts, the other institutional--it is notable that a parent, the school system, and the newspapers and television were more important information sources for the Webster girls than for the non-Webster girls. (It will be recalled that a persistent parent was more likely to be successful than a less persistent one in getting a girl admitted to the Webster program, especially as the school became more crowded.) Among the latter group, a friend, a medical institution (especially a clinic), and a social worker were relatively more important.

Of the 232 girls in the study, 123 of them did not attend Webster, for a variety of reasons.[23] As mentioned above, eight per cent of them never knew of the program. Another fifth said they knew of the school but did not consider going there, because they were more than four months pregnant,[24] they had no interest in school, they had made no plans for themselves at that time, they opted for maternity home care, and so forth. Among those who did consider going to Webster, the most frequent reason given for not doing so was that the school was overcrowded (56% said this); and another ten per cent were too near delivery, at least by the time their names came up on the waiting list. An additional seven per cent did not want to go to Webster even though they considered it; some just lost interest and a few were uncomfortable about "personal questions" asked of them.

---

[23] It is particularly unfortunate that there was no measure made of "willingness to go to Webster," and that only partial indications of the extent to which non-Webster girls selected themselves out of possible participation in the program are available. Ideally, such a measure would have been obtained at the time the girl was referred to Webster, but even a retrospective report might have been useful here. This is a deficiency in the study design.

[24] Apparently, the selection priority factor of "in the early months of pregnancy" was set at four months, although many of the group who did attend the school were in fact farther along in their pregnancy when they entered Webster. The four-months provision may have been more stringently enforced in the later part of the year, when demand so exceeded openings in the program.

Perceptions of the School

The non-Webster girls were asked about their perceptions of the Webster program, "what kinds of girls go there, what they study, and so forth." The importance of examining these perceptions is that what people think about something influences their behavior toward it. Thus, for example, a widespread impression that Webster is "a kind of prison to make the girls feel ashamed," as one girl put it, might be reflected in fewer applications than would be the case if the general picture of the program were more benevolent. And broad general misunderstanding of the purposes and characteristics of the school could suggest a need for public education.[25]

Two-thirds of the girls differentiated Webster in terms of the fact that all its students were pregnant. This exceptional circumstance aside, the great majority of girls described the Webster program as one in which the students "study straight courses." Some knew that there was also special instruction in baby care. There is evidence of misunderstanding among some of what the Webster program amounts to. There were scattered references to high tuition costs, adoption procedures, and being allowed to go home only on weekends, for example. In some instances it seems fairly clear that there was some confusion of Webster with the Ionia R. Whipper Home, traditionally a local residential maternity home for Negroes. In other cases, the nature of the confusion is less clear.

---

[25] It is recognized, of course, that there has been increasing publicity about the program as time has gone along.

The girls were also asked more specifically whether as far as they knew "any pregnant girl can get into Webster who wants to." Table 36 shows the ideas of the qualifications for attendance among those who answered the question in the negative.

TABLE 36

WHO CANNOT ATTEND WEBSTER, ACCORDING TO THE NON-WEBSTER GIRLS

Webster Is Closed to Girls Who:	Number Mentioning This
Are married	7
Are pregnant for the second time	5
Are not good and/or interested students	6
Are outside certain ages	2
Are from high-income families	2
Are too far along in their pregnancy	2
Do not care about the baby, do not have plans for child care later, or do not have permission from regular school to enter	1 each

Another ten girls mentioned that the only limitation of the program of which they knew was its capacity to accommodate the demand. Some of these qualifications were mistaken perceptions (such as those about limits on family income, or the necessity to be unmarried), but others of the qualifications did operate that year, such as restrictions on girls who were in their second pregnancy or who were close to delivery. In general, however, it appears that the girls had a fairly accurate picture of at least this aspect of the Webster program.

Whether or not she considered going to Webster, or actually did go, nearly every girl said that she thought a Webster-type program would be good for all school-age pregnant girls. There were occasional hints of the suspicion that such a program might encourage girls to become pregnant, but these were rare, among both the girls and their mothers. Responses were much more frequently along the lines of "it gives them a second chance," "it keeps them up with their class," and "it lets them know that their life isn't over."

The Time at Webster

Attention will be shifted here to the girls who went to Webster, what happened to them there, and what they thought about it.

The girls spent a median of 18 weeks enrolled at Webster altogether (some continued on the rolls the second year). All but 16 per cent stayed in school up until the time of delivery. The girls who left did so for a variety of reasons. A few left because it was the end of the school year, and the baby was born during the summer; these are not really in the same class as the rest of those who stopped school early. The reason most frequently given for leaving Webster before the baby came was illness and/or false labor--six girls left for this reason. Apparently, sometimes when a girl experienced a false alarm and left to go to the hospital, she decided just to stay out of school afterward rather than to return (on the other hand, other girls did return and stayed until the baby actually arrived). Two girls left Webster because of difficulty in getting there from home by public transportation. Two others chose instead to enter a maternity home (one whose mother worked at night and was afraid to leave the girl at home alone, and one who said that "my sister was afraid that I would get too big, and she was afraid of what the neighbors would say, so I went to a maternity home"). One lost interest in school, another was needed to help out at home, and a third left because she felt awkward as the only white girl in the school. (There was a white girl at Webster for several months, but she arrived after the first had left.)

Nearly all the girls found full agreement from their families on the decision to attend Webster. What opposition did come from family members had to do with problems of public admission of the pregnancy (e.g., "My mother worried about what people would say. . . . She wanted me to go to Baltimore with my aunt."); with wishes for more intensive care and adoption arrangements, as at a maternity home; and with the notion that "if I had wanted to go to school, I wouldn't have gotten pregnant," as one girl reported her mother's remarks. Another girl said that "my aunt thought that later in life I might meet one of the girls at Webster and that she would embarrass me. She thought I should stay home."

Inquiry was made about the girls' friendships, if any, at Webster, partly to see whether involvement in friendship networks there might be a factor in reinforcing some of the attitudes and ways of thinking they may have learned at the school. As it turns out, the friendships seem to have been confined mostly to the school surroundings: nearly three-quarters of those who reported that they were "close friends" with other Webster students while they were there said that they and their friends did things "mainly just in school"; only 23 per cent said they did things together both inside and outside of school.[26] What is more, the friendship groups tended to dissolve or attenuate rather soon after the girls left Webster, and only eight per cent of the girls reported that their friendship group was still pretty much intact.[27]

Of those girls with friends at Webster (84% of the total), fully 70 per cent had known one or more of those friends before entering the program, The probabilities of this happening by accident are likely to be quite low, given the number of students in any particular school and the number of schools (33) from which the girls came. A check on possible bases of these friendship groups in the schools from which the girls came to Webster (and hence to some extent their neighborhoods) showed that it made no difference whether the girls had gone to the same school before. Those who transferred from schools which sent relatively few students to Webster were no less likely to have known their Webster friends before than were those from schools with a relatively large number of representatives. Examination of the social systems of young pregnancy in the school or the neighborhood would itself make an interesting study.

To get an idea of the girls' pictures of the general student body at Webster when they were there, they were asked to react to a series of descriptive phrases for "most of the girls at Webster." Taking as an arbitrary criterion 50 per cent agreement or disagreement, the girls thought that the Webster students were friendly (95% agreed), just the same as girls at any other school (84%), interested in school (72%), and studious (57%). They were not bad girls (82% disagreed that they were), or hard to get to know (78%), nor did they want to be somewhere else rather than in school (53%). There was disagreement on whether the girls were "out for a good time" (31% agreed, 45% disagreed), or thought more about the baby than about schoolwork (35% agreed, 32% disagreed).

---

[26] This is probably not notably different from girls in regular school. Coleman found, for example, that "school-related activities are more nearly a basis of friendship among girls than they are among boys." (J. S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society [New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961]).

[27] Of course, many of the girls had moved at least once since they left Webster, which would work against group maintenance; others married, and those who returned to school usually were required to attend a different school than they attended when they became pregnant.

Exactly comparable judgments of their peers in the school from which the girls came to Webster are not available, but they were asked whether "Webster was pretty different from other schools you have gone to, or was it pretty much the same as regular school?" About half said that Webster was essentially like other schools in their experience. Those who felt that Webster was different most frequently cited differences in the physical plant (fewer steps to climb, crowded classrooms) and the rules and regulations governing their behavior (generally more permissive). Next in importance were differences in the general atmosphere at Webster, greater concern for the individual girl, more personal attention, more understanding, greater comfort on the girl's part. Two other categories of difference were mentioned with equal frequency: differences in the people at Webster (e.g., the teachers seemed to care more about the students; the girls were all pregnant) and in the work they were given to do.

Nearly all the girls thought that they had done as well or better as students at Webster than they had before. This is an overestimation, at least in terms of grade performance compared with grades the full year before they became pregnant. By that measure, 34 per cent did better work, and another 54 per cent did as well as the year before. Thirty-six per cent of the girls judged their relative performance accurately by the measure of academic standing.

Several kinds of explanation were given for doing better as students. A few quotations from the interviews will illustrate the range.

Administrative factors:

> There were not as many students and the teachers could take time out to help you.
>
> The teachers were more understanding. There wasn't so much strain.

Scholastic factors:

> I made better grades. I paid more attention to the work.
>
> I don't know. I just wanted to do the work at Webster. I just enjoyed the school. I made my first A there.
>
> The work seemed easier to me.

Social factors:

> There weren't any boys there.
>
> Well, I didn't know as many girls at first and, well, being around friends sort of holds you back, like at the school before I went to Webster.
>
> I did better . . . because I was not around so many friends.

Personal factors:

> Because you had a problem on your mind you might as well study--nothing else to do.
>
> Because it looks like it took my getting pregnant to get a more serious outlook on life.
>
> I was at ease. All the girls around me were the same. I did not worry about who was looking at me.

Among all the things that the girls learned at Webster, the most useful to the largest proportion was the instruction in baby care. Smaller proportions found the most useful things were skills acquired in their regular class work, notably in commercial courses such as typing, and points of view which they had acquired about love and sexual behavior. Other "most useful" things included cooking and sewing, nutrition, and "my outlook on life." That utility did indeed seem to be the referent of these answers (as is appropriate rather than, for example, interest) is illustrated by the response of one girl who said that nothing had been useful to her, since she had had another child after leaving the program. She was clearly thinking in terms of "how well the program worked."

TABLE 37

THE MOST USEFUL THING LEARNED AT WEBSTER
(In Percentages)

The Most Useful Thing Was:	Response (N=109)
Baby care	40
Academic subject(s)	15
Attitudes toward love and sex	10
An outlook on life	5
Nutrition	4
Cooking and sewing	3
Other, no answer	5
Everything	2
Nothing	16
	100

The Special Aspects of the Program

The work of the specialists in the program, the "multidisciplinary team," as seen by the girls, was varied and covered many matters of relevance to their lives. The respondents were asked to tell what each of the types of specialist did in the school, and how useful that had been to them. This form of getting the information was bound to, and did, result in quite a varied list of functions for each of the specialties. (Of course, this is only one part of the "truth" of their work, since these are reports from the girls, who were not privy to work, discussions, plans, and exchanges of information which went on out of their sight. The girls could, of course, report only on some of the results of what went on behind the scenes.)

Keeping in mind that several specific functions were named for each specialist, attention will be concentrated on those most frequently named as "what that person did at the school." Restricting attention to the modal function in this way will facilitate focussing more on the central components of the specialist's role, and less on individual experiences of the girl with the individual specialist. For example, if one of the social workers had occasion to discuss a girl's sex life with her, formally or informally, briefly or at length, that discussion might get reported as part of what the social worker did in the program. And that is correct. But unless this happens to a relatively large proportion of the group of girls it is not, in a sense, central to the social worker role in the program as experienced by the students. (It is, of course, recognized that in fact one of the central components of the social worker's role from her point of view is the giving of individual attention to the girls.) Using this technique, it will be possible to utilize the "residual" functions as a measure of the diffuseness of the role in question or at least of the role as performed. It should be reemphasized here that these roles are the roles as perceived and reported by the girls.

The social workers were involved primarily in discussing the girls' personal problems with them, and helping them with those problems. This activity was the most frequently mentioned one, and accounted for about a third of the 145 specific responses to the question. This function of the social worker was usually thought to have been very useful by the girls.[28] The social worker role was the most diffuse of the four specialist roles, as indicated by the two-thirds of responses unaccounted for by the modal category. Whatever the function, the work of the social workers was rated very useful 74 per cent of the time; only three per cent of the ratings were "not so" or "not at all useful." Six girls said either that there were no social workers connected with the school or that they had had no contact with one.

The psychologist's role in the program was seen as one with two central components, giving tests[29] and talking and answering questions about a variety of things, including marriage, sex, love, and child-raising. Together, they accounted for 36 per cent of the responses to the question.[30]

---

[28] On a four-step scale running from "very useful" to "not at all useful" in the girl's life since she went to Webster.

[29] The tests referred to included attitude tests, tests of mental maturity, and projective personality tests.

[30] Eight girls said that there had been no psychologist at the school or that they had not been in contact with her.

This is another instance of a relatively diffuse role. Forty-six per cent of all the activities were rated as very useful, and ten per cent as of little or no use to the girl. This is a relatively low "very useful" proportion, but it would be highly unlikely that the administration of tests, indirectly related to the girl's daily life as they are (and limited in time in a way that baby care, for example, is not), would be rated as useful. Indeed, when the ratings on the "talking and answering questions" items were examined separately, 65 per cent were very useful.

The nurse was chiefly involved in instruction on baby care, in the view of the girls, although she was unknown to or not in contact with sixteen of them. Here, somewhat less diversity of role function is suggested by the responses: baby care accounted for 52 per cent of all answers. Not surprisingly, the usefulness rating of the instruction in baby care was the highest of all the specialists' functions--78 per cent of the ratings were "very useful," and only three per cent went as low as "not very useful."[31] Over-all, the nurse's work was said to have been very useful 72 per cent of the time.

Finally, the nutritionist's job was also seen as having two main components, giving instruction on maternity diets and on proper nutrition and food selection in general. This role is the least diffuse of all, according to the girls' descriptions--the two components account for 88 per cent of the responses. The information the girls got from this instruction was about the lowest in usefulness of the work of any of the specialists, perhaps partly because "proper" diets and general nutrition may not have been feasible in families with relatively low income, they may not have been consonant with the girl's accustomed cuisine, and/or the girl's mother was more likely than the girl to plan and prepare meals, thereby reducing the chances for the girl to put her instruction into practice (one component of usefulness). Sixteen girls said they had had no contact with the nutritionist at Webster (she was apparently at the school only about eight hours a week the first year).

---

[31] Recall that baby care was most frequently named as the single most useful thing learned in the program.

Table 38 recapitulates some of the information on the girls' views of the work of the special staff.

TABLE 38

THE WORK OF THE SPECIALISTS
(In Percentages)

Specialist	Primary Function(s)	Per Cent of Responses		Usefulness of Function[a]		Over-all Usefulness of Role[a]
Social workers	Help with personal problems	35		76		74
Psychologist	Give tests	23	36	40	49	46
	Talk and answer questions	13		65		
Nurse	Baby care	52		78		72
Nutritionist	Maternity diet	48	88	49	49	47
	Proper general diet	40		50		

[a] Per cent saying "very useful."

On the Question of Visibility

In setting up the Webster program, there was some concern about whether there might be a problem of visibility associated with participation. Or, as the program proposal put it, part of the school's purpose was "to demonstrate . . . the extent of participation by pregnant girls . . . in an organized group in which they might become publicly identified."

Although this matter was not explicitly and systematically explored in the interviews, there were several points at which answers to other questions bore on the issue. It will be recalled, for instance, that several girls said that they did better as students because there were no boys, or other friends, around to distract them. On another question, several said that they thought the Webster program was a good thing for them personally because they came to know that they were not alone in their predicament. Some of the mothers, too, shared this view, in telling why they thought Webster was a good idea:

> I think it is good because the girls will be with girls who have a similar problem.
>
> A girl can continue her education with people in a similar position.
>
> They're ashamed. They like to be together, not self-conscious.

The general impression comes through that separation into a separate school (and program) in fact worked positively for the girls, encouraged them to work harder there, and helped to lessen their sense of visibility.

As reported earlier, a few girls and mothers expressed some concern that this supportive atmosphere might lead to more pregnancies, because it removed some of the insecurity, shame, and fear which they seemed to see as a factor in inhibition of sexual activity. It will be seen below that this is apparently an erroneous supposition, but it is of importance to the extent that it may affect decisions about applying for entrance to the program.

THE EVALUATION: THE RETURN TO SCHOOL

It was mentioned in the first section of the report that the mode of evaluation used in this study was to compare the post-delivery experiences of the Webster and control groups. Implied in this approach is the assumption that differences between the groups is attributable to attendance in the Webster program, and that in other respects the girls in each group are essentially similar. It will be remembered, however, that the Webster girls differed to some extent from those of the control group in their socioeconomic status. It is necessary to keep these differences in mind in assessing the findings, to allow for the operation of this important extra-Webster factor. Data will be presented at appropriate points in the narrative on the influence of socioeconomic status on the return to school and the production of additional children.

In addition to comparing the Webster and control groups to measure the influence of participation in the program, it will be possible to examine the experiences of a group of 33 Webster girls who were selected to receive special attention while they were enrolled in the program. The suggestion would be that, if the Webster program was effective in modifying behavior in the return to school and the bearing of more babies, the effects should be emphasized in this group.

That is, if attendance at Webster is associated with lower school dropout rates in comparison with the non-Webster group, the 33 girls who received special attention should display an even lower dropout rate than that for the Webster group as a whole.

The special group consisted of girls who came to the attention of the school staff because they presented particularly difficult problems which seemed to call for more intensive study and treatment than that provided for the Webster girls in general. The special treatment was described briefly in a memorandum from the project supervisor.

> Psychological Services: Depth studies were made. Psychological and academic backgrounds were studied. Attitudes toward selves, peers, school, sex, family and . . . fathers were determined. Eight to sixteen hours of personal contact and individual consultation were given in individual testing . . . , evaluation of intelligence and achievement, and in vocational and educational guidance.
>
> Social Case Work Services: More time was spent in counseling girls and their families. More home visits were made in order to give special attention to particular needs that had been identified. Students and parents were directed to community services. More personal services were given through the school --free lunches, bus fare, maternity clothes, job placement.
>
> More contacts were made by and with [the babies'] fathers. Help was given to some toward finding jobs.
>
> Students and families who were given most intensive casework seemed to call more freely on the workers in times of stress both during and after the girl's stay at Webster.
>
> Educational Services: Teachers gave special attention to these girls according to needs as they had observed them and according to recommendations . . . from the [special staff] conferences. Girls having special educational problems were given individual instruction, use of special teaching techniques and materials, and special opportunities to select and work out special projects in the various subject fields.

Medical Services: The nurse assigned to the project made special requests when necessary for records of previous illnesses which may have a bearing on present problems. Records were obtained from hospitals or mental health clinics when needed. Referrals were made to other health services when necessary.

Three measures of educational continuity were used: whether or not the girl continued with regular school following the baby's birth; the point at which she dropped out of school if she did so; and her grade average (if she returned to regular school) compared with her performance the year before she became pregnant. Grades from the full year before the pregnancy were used instead of those from the year the baby was born, in an attempt to minimize possible effects on academic performance traceable to distractions of being pregnant, such as worry, embarrassment, etc. Thus, the measure is of the girl's performance as a "student," rather than as a "pregnant student."

Girls who went to Webster were significantly more likely to continue with regular school than were the non-Webster girls. They graduated from high school at greater rates and dropped out less frequently.

TABLE 39

SCHOOL STATUS FOLLOWING THE BABY'S BIRTH
(In Percentages)

School Status	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=122)
Still in school	37	28
Graduated	22	8
Dropped out	41	64
	100	100

$x^2 = 14.4$; d.f. = 2; $P < .001$

A word on definitions is in order here. A girl was considered a dropout if she had not been in school during the 1964-1965 school season, or did not complete the year, and did not indicate that she planned to return to school in the fall of 1965. Whether or not she was in school in 1964-1965, she was classed as still in school if she said she planned to go to school in the fall. Of course, intentions or wishes to return to school do not guarantee attendance, and it is frequently easier to say one expects to go to school than actually to do so. But it is valid to compare answers within the study group to this question, since there is little reason to suppose that the Webster girls would say they expected to be in school more often than the non-Webster girls.

It will be remembered that the Webster girls were farther along in school than their non-Webster counterparts, although they were of the same age. This necessitates the introduction into the relationship of a control for grade of school. For each grade level, the dropout rates were consistently lower for the Webster group, with the exception of those who were in the ninth grade when they became pregnant (but the rates here are very close to each other, closer than for any other grade).

TABLE 40

GRADE OF SCHOOL THE YEAR OF PREGNANCY AND DROPOUT RATES

	Per Cent Who Dropped Out:			
Grade of School	Webster		Non-Webster	
7th	(N= 6)	33	(N=14)	64
8th	(N=18)	44	(N=27)	78
9th	(N=25)	68	(N=36)	61
10th	(N=27)	48	(N=22)	72
11th	(N=18)	22	(N=11)	45
12th	(N=15)	7	(N= 9)	33

Table 40 also shows that the likelihood a girl would drop out following her pregnancy was apparently affected by what grade of school she was in when she became pregnant. For the Webster girls, the most vulnerable year in which to have become pregnant was the ninth grade; that for the non-Webster girls the eighth grade. The difference in the "most vulnerable year" was a function of the non-Webster group's tendency to be farther behind their "proper" grade level, and reflected in both groups the girls' approach to age 16, when they are legally free to leave school.

The dropout rates were adjusted for age, to exclude those girls who were 16 or older at the time of the baby's birth, and to examine what might be termed "baby dropouts." This seperation lowers the dropout rates to 18 per cent among the Webster girls and 29 per cent among the other group, about 44 per cent fewer girls. Eliminating girls close to or over 16 lowers the dropout rates equally for both groups of girls, however, leaving the differential between them intact, and the apparent effect of attendance at Webster on dropping out of school remains.[32]

As predicted, dropout rates among the 33 girls who were given special attention at Webster were lower than those for the Webster group as a whole, dropping to 33 per cent. This is not a significantly lower dropout rate, but it is in the predicted direction.

Among the dropouts, there was a significant difference between the groups in the timing of leaving school. Whereas most of the Webster dropouts returned to regular school following the baby's birth, and left sometime afterward, this was the case with only a little over a fourth of the non-Webster group, who were more likely to make their excuse from school during their pregnancy a permanent thing.

---

[32] Dropping out seems to be associated to some extent with marrying. Girls in both groups who married after the baby came dropped out at a higher rate than did others.

TABLE 41

TIMING OF THE DROPOUT
(In Percentages)

Dropout Occurred	Webster (N=45)	Non-Webster (N=78)
At time of pregnancy or following delivery	27	72
After returning to regular school	73	28
	100	100

$x^2 = 23.9$; d.f. = 1; $P < .001$

Attendance at Webster enhanced graduation rates, as well. If a girl was in the twelfth grade the year she became pregnant, the chances were 83 per cent that she would eventually graduate. But if she did not go to Webster, the likelihood that she would graduate went down to 67 per cent. If a girl was in the eleventh grade when she became pregnant, her chances of graduating were lower (48% over-all), but still better if she went to Webster (56%) than if she did not (36%).

Socioeconomic status (as measured here by per capita monthly income) did not make a significant difference in the return to school, but there are indications that socioeconomic status probably exerted some influence in both groups of girls, as shown in Table 42. It will be noted that non-Webster dropout rates are consistently higher at each income level, supporting again the observation that attendance at Webster made a difference.

TABLE 42

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOOL STATUS

Per Capita Monthly Income	Per Cent Who Dropped Out: Webster (N=97)	Per Cent Who Dropped Out: Non-Webster (N=100)
$39 or less	48	68
$40 - $79	46	58
$80 or more	32	48

What a girl does about returning to school is, of course, at least partially a function of her attitudes toward school, and of those around her, such as friends and family. Data are available from the interviews on the girl's attitude toward the importance of high school graduation, as well as her perceptions of the same attitudes among her friends and members of her family.

Nearly everyone said that it is important for a girl to finish high school. Large proportions of each group said that graduating is "more important than just about anything else a girl can do." Graduation was said to be important primarily as a means to get a better job, or, indeed, any job at all. For a few girls, education seemed to be an end in itself, a "good thing." At this level, the girl's expressions of the importance of graduation give some indication of what she was likely to do about staying in school: if she attached relatively great importance to high school graduation, she was less likely to drop out (34% of the Webster girls did, 60% of the non-Webster) than if she thought it to be of somewhat less importance (65% Webster, 74% non-Webster).[33] The same was true with the effect of friends' and family's attitudes toward graduation. Those who perceived that their friends and families placed a high value on graduation were less likely to drop out than those who said they had fewer such environmental supports for staying in school. But these relationships do not predict the intergroup differences in who dropped out and who continued in school.

TABLE 43

THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION
(In Percentages)

Perceived Importance	Webster (N=108)	Non-Webster (N=123)
For a girl like me, finishing high school is most important, more important than just about anything else a girl can do	81	74
Finishing high school is important, but other things are important, too, even more important sometimes	17	23
Finishing high school is not so important, really, but a good idea sometimes	2	2
Finishing high school is not important at all	-	1
	100	100

---

[33] The possibility arises, of course, that the girls would have answered in such a way as to justify their own behavior with respect to school, to think school of less importance because they had dropped out. This may indeed be the case for at least some: 30% of the dropouts said that school was less than most important, but only 14% of those who were still in school or had graduated.

When the girls were asked to say which was more important within each of two pairs of possibilities--"working or going to school," and "staying home to take care of the baby or going to school"--school was in each case the more frequently chosen. Again, there is no difference between the two groups in this respect, and this measure of the value the girls put on continuing in school does not explain their different experiences with the school system after the baby was born.

TABLE 44

VALUES ON SCHOOL
(In Percentages)

Girl Chose	Webster (N=95)	Non-Webster (N=108)
School over baby	76	74
Baby over school	22	26
Cannot choose	2	-
	100	100
School over work	91	82
Work over school	8	17
Cannot choose	1	1
	100	100

Attitudes of various people around the girl (as reported by her) seem both to predict the girl's behavior with respect to returning to school and to explain the differences in the experiences of the two groups. The number of perceived environmental sources of support for finishing school were combined to form a "support scale." A girl could have had three supports for staying in school (self, friends, family), two (self/friends, self/family, friends/family) one, or none. The hypothesis here would be that dropout rates increase regularly as amount of support decreases.[34] Table 45 shows that the hypothesis was confirmed for both groups--that more interpersonal support for staying in school was associated with doing so.

TABLE 45

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IN SCHOOL STATUS

Number of Sources of Support	Per Cent Who Dropped Out: Webster		Non-Webster	
3	(N=33)	24	(N=25)	44
2	(N=40)	38	(N=44)	61
1	(N=23)	52	(N=39)	74
0	(N=10)	70	(N=13)	77
Break: 2 or 3/less:	x^2=6.6; d.f.=1; $P < .01$		x^2=5.2; d.f.=1; $P < .05$	

The different experiences of the two groups with the school system is partially a function of the tendency among the Webster girls to have had a larger number of perceived sources of support for staying in school following the baby's birth--69 per cent had two or three--than the non-Webster girls--57 per cent had that many. The difference between the groups does not quite reach significance, but the numbers fall in the expected direction.

---

[34] Dropout rates were used here rather than rates of graduation or the proportions still in school, partly because the larger number of cases allowed for greater ease of statistical manipulation.

Still another factor may be added, if the Webster program can be interpreted as an institutional source of support for staying in school, and this would certainly seem to be a reasonable way to view the program. When attendance at Webster was included as a source of support, the same pattern obtained as that above: the greater the number of factors supporting the return to school, the lower the probability that a girl would drop out.[35] Indeed, when the Webster factor was present, dropout rates were only about 60 per cent of those obtaining when this factor was missing.

Comparative information on classroom performance, as measured by grades, before[36] and after the baby's birth is available for 47 Webster girls and 28 non-Webster girls. (For 138 there were no grades because they were not in school a full year before and/or after the pregnancy. For another 14 girls there were no school records for either or both years.) These figures must be interpreted with great caution, since they are small and refer to only a minority of girls in each group. The girls in each group had approximately the same history. As groups, the girls had about the same standing in grades received before and after the pregnancy. Forty-six per cent of the Webster girls before and 44 per cent after earned a grade average of C or higher; 65 per cent of the non-Webster group before and 64 per cent after were at that level. Individually, there was considerable movement, although there was no difference between the groups in proportions raising, maintaining, or lowering their grade level.[37] In evaluating these figures, it will be remembered that the non-Webster girls were behind their age peers who went to Webster in their year of school.

---

[35] Incidentally, the length of time a girl spent at Webster did not seem to be systematically related to whether or not she eventually dropped out of school.

[36] Again, the full year before the pregnancy was used in order to observe the girl's performance in a nonpregnant state in each period.

TABLE 46

CHANGES IN GRADE PERFORMANCE
(In Percentages)

Grade Level	Webster (N=47)	Non-Webster (N=28)
Raised	28	29
Stayed the same	47	42
Lowered	25	29
	100	100

Among the reasons given for staying out of school during the 1964-1965 school year, the most frequent in each group was that the girl was pregnant again. This accounted for a fourth to a third of the girls. Babysitting problems were second most important in keeping girls home, and when cases in which a girl was needed at home (e.g., when a mother who normally cared for the baby became ill and had no replacement) are added in, demands from the home accounted for between a fifth and a third of the girls not in school that year. About another ten per cent of each group had lost interest in school, and a lack of money to live on or to buy the necessities for school accounted for six per cent of the Webster and 11 per cent of the non-Webster girls who were out of school. It is probable that among the group who stayed out because they were needed at home or because they were mainly responsible for babysitting the situation was a temporary one for some. They may have been freed to return to school sometime not too much later. For those pregnant with another baby, or who had not made arrangements for child care which would allow them to be away in the daytime or evenings, the prospects were likely to be less bright for them to continue with their education.[38]

---

[37] Change is defined here as movement by a whole grade level, e.g., from a C to a B average. Movement from a D to a C+ or B- average would not be counted as a change. It should also be pointed out that a C+ and a B- were categorized together as an intermediate class, and no distinction was made between them.

It might be of interest to look at the implications of attendance at Webster for the girls' early occupational history, the area for which most respondents felt finishing high school was most important. Although the 29 girls who were at work after they left school were at very early points in their occupational careers at the time they were interviewed, differences between the two groups were already observable. The Webster girls seemed to hold better jobs (and to earn more money) than those who had not participated in the program. Among the Webster group, the most frequent occupation was a clerical one (clerk-typist, stenographer), while only three non-Webster girls held such jobs. They were more likely to hold jobs with lower skill requirements, such as waitress and counter-girl, or hospital aide. Further, the Webster girls' jobs were more likely to be full-time and regular (all but two) than part-time and/or sporadic (which accounted for eight of the 13 jobs held by non-Webster girls).

---

[38] This assumes that those who stayed out would have returned if not for their situation; that, for example, another pregnancy was the only reason that the girl was not in school. The assumption that there was only one reason for staying out is, however, most unwarranted, and no statements can be made on the basis of the data in this study about what proportion of the girls would have been in school if they had not been pregnant, if their mothers had been well, if they could have found a(nother) babysitter, etc.

TABLE 47

THE JOBS
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=16)	Non-Webster (N=13)
Clerical	56	23
Waitress, counter girl	19	31
Nurse's aide	6	31
Laundry, dry cleaning	13	8
Other	6	7
	100	100

The Webster girls' earnings were correspondingly greater than those of the other group: the Webster group's income averaged about $53 a week, compared with an average of $45 per week earned by the non-Webster girls.

In summary, then, the girls who went to Webster while they were pregnant stayed in regular school afterward more often, dropped out later, graduated more frequently, and were able to find better and more stable employment when they went to work.

THE EVALUATION: REPEATED PREGNANCIES

The matter of repeated pregnancies was of interest for several reasons. One is that it was an area in which Webster attempted to alter the girls' behavior by discouraging premarital sexual activity. This was particularly the province of the psychologist, and especially in the "group sessions" she conducted, although others on the staff got involved in the issue from time to time. Reduction of the number of additional pregnancies serves not only the general goal of fewer illegitimate children born to young people likely to be or to become dependent. It also affects on a very practical level the goal of educational continuity and in a simple way: a girl with several children is less likely to be able to finish school than a girl with none or only one, because she loses time from the classroom when she is pregnant, she frequently cannot afford not to work with several children to support, and so forth.

Data on additional children came from the girls themselves,[39] and include two subgroups which are combined in the analysis: children born after the Webster baby and alive at the time of the interview; and children still in utero at that time. It is unlikely that all of the pregnancies will result in living children, and the absolute figures for additional babies are thereby slightly inflated. (On the other hand, no information was gathered on post-Webster pregnancies which did not produce live children.)

---

[39] It is recognized that repeated pregnancies are a different issue for the married girls, and that additional children do not constitute a "problem" in exactly the way they do for the unmarried girls. However, the two groups share certain characteristics aside from their marital status, such as their relative youth, which makes their continuing reproduction patterns of equal interest.

The study group as a whole had had 62 additional children by the time they were interviewed, and 37 girls were pregnant. Three of the pregnant girls (one Webster, two non-Webster) were on their third child by that time. Counting the babies which brought them in touch with Webster, the girls contributed 311 children[40] to the population, a mean of 1.2 for the Webster and 1.5 for the non-Webster girls.

As a kind of guide to evaluation of this figure, compare it to what could have happened if every girl had, three months after the Webster baby was born, become pregnant again, and, after that baby was born became pregnant again three months later, and so on.[41] If this had been the case, there would have been at the time of interview a total of 390 babies (allowing for a 7% fetal death rate) and 141 pregnancies (resulting in 131 babies), for a total of 521, or 306 in addition to the babies of this study. In fact, the 62 additional babies and 37 pregnancies (which with a 7% loss would result in 34 children) amounted to about a third of the number possible. The total number of babies, including the Webster children, came to about 60 per cent of the maximum number estimated above.

---

[40] This is known births and pregnancies. There was no information for a few girls.

[41] The estimate of a median of three months required to become pregnant is roughly in accordance with the experiences of the girls in the study. See C. Tietze, et al., "Time Required for Conception in 1727 Planned Pregnancies," Fertility and Sterility (Volume 1, 1950), pp. 338-346. That study actually estimated a median of 2.3 months.

The Webster girls were significantly less likely than the non-Webster group to have had another child or to be pregnant by the time they were interviewed. Again, this effect was exaggerated among (but not significantly different for) the girls who received special attention at Webster, whose rate of repeated pregnancies dropped to 18 per cent. (One additional girl had been pregnant again but had lost the baby.)

TABLE 48

ADDITIONAL CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=109)	Non-Webster (N=121)
None	72	47
None, but pregnant	19	31
One, not pregnant	8	20
One, and pregnant	1	2
	100	100

Break: No other/1 or more: $x^2 = 14.2$; d.f. = 1; $P < .001$

In both groups, the girls who had been in junior high school when they became pregnant with the Webster baby were disproportionately responsible for additional children. Forty-five per cent of the Webster group were in junior high school when they became pregnant, but 59 per cent of the additional children came from this group. And although 63 per cent of the non-Webster girls were in junior high school that year, they contributed 73 per cent of the new babies born to non-Webster girls.

The junior high/high school differentials in new babies were not significant, but when the data were combined in a slightly different way, an important function of attendance at Webster emerged. Although Webster attendance lowered the chances of an additional pregnancy in general, this effect was somewhat more noticeable among the junior high school girls. Thus, Webster appears to have had its greatest effect on the group most in need of it, by reducing additional pregnancies more among the group from which the majority of new children came.

TABLE 49

GRADE OF SCHOOL AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

Additional Children	High School		Junior High School	
	Webster (N=60)	Non-Webster (N=42)	Webster (N=49)	Non-Webster (N=76)
1 or more[a]	22	40	37	59
None	78	60	63	41
	100	100	100	100
	$x^2 = 4.9$; d.f. = 1; $P < .05$		$x^2 = 6.6$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$	

[a] Includes those who had no additional live child but were pregnant when interviewed.

It might be predicted that the longer time a girl spent as part of the Webster program the greater would be the chances that the aims of the program would "take," i.e., that she would be less likely to have additional children. As it develops, however, the number of months spent at Webster was not systematically related to her production of more children. As was the case with the return to school, socioeconomic status was not significantly associated with the production of additional children, although, again, the data were distributed in the expected direction, except for the slight rise in the proportion of new babies among the non-Webster girls at the highest income level. (That increase is not, however, very large, and certainly smaller than the relative decreases as income goes up.) Also again, there is a distinct Webster/non-Webster differential at each income level.

TABLE 50

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN

Per Capita Monthly Income	Per Cent With Another Child or Pregnant: Webster (N=97)	Non-Webster (N=100)
$39 or less	36	57
$40 - $79	31	42
$80 or more	23	44

An attempt was made to test additional alternative hypotheses which might shed more light on the circumstances under which a girl would or would not have additional children. Information was gathered on the effects of the girl's reintegration into old friendships and activities after the baby's birth, the effects of her living arrangements, and the role of her knowledge and use of birth control techniques.

With respect to the girl's social (re)integration, the hypothesis would be that those who remained in or became reinvolved in the social networks they maintained when they became pregnant were more likely to become pregnant again than those whose surroundings were new or different. The girls were asked whether their leisure-time activities were different from what they were before the baby came, whether they had the same friends as before, and whether they continued to see the father of the Webster baby. The indicators of a high level of reintegration would be that the girl did not change her leisure-time activities, she reported no change in friendships, and that she continued to see the baby's father (if she was not married to him).

TABLE 51

CHANGES IN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Social Networks	Per Cent Reporting No Changes: Webster	Non-Webster
Leisure-time activities[a]	69	71
Friends[b]	84	83
Seeing the baby's father[c]	46	44

[a] N=108 Webster, 121 non-Webster.

[b] N=109 Webster, 120 non-Webster.

[c] N=107 Webster, 115 non-Webster. Eighteen Webster and 32 non-Webster girls were married to him.

Not only was there no difference between Webster and non-Webster girls in the extent to which they maintained (or resumed) their regular social relationships, but whether or not a girl made a change in these relationships had no significant effect on her chances of having another baby.

TABLE 52

CHANGES IN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN[a]

	Per Cent Who Have One or More Additional Children
Leisure-Time Activities	
Have changed	29
Have not changed	31
Friends	
Have changed	14
Have not changed	18
Sees the Baby's Father	
Seldom or never[b]	30
More often	37

[a] The study group is treated as a whole in this table.

[b] No more often than once a month or so. Again several girls were married to him.

It is important to keep in mind that these may not be the proper measures of integration and value milieu, or that they may not have been properly measured. It should also be pointed out that the girls who were interviewed were still living in the city and could be traced through relatives and neighbors, even though a good many had moved from the address given at the time they contacted the Webster school. Here, the loss of girls who could not be tracked down or who had moved to distant cities is particularly unfortunate, since they may very well represent an extreme of nonintegration. This is an important bias in the composition of the study group.

Certain characteristics of family composition bore on whether a girl had additional children. For the study group as a whole (excluding the girls who had established separate families with their husbands), living in a family with both parents did not seem to be associated with fewer additional children.

TABLE 53

FAMILY COMPOSITION AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

Additional Children	Girl Lives In A Full Family (N=87)	Girl Lives In A Broken Family (N=103)
None	66	61
One or more	34	39
	100	100

When this relationship was controlled for attendance at Webster, however, a girl was significantly less likely to have had an additional baby or to be pregnant if she lived in an unbroken family and went to Webster. Among the non-Webster group, it made no difference whether or not the family was broken.[42] Data bearing directly on why this should be so are not available from the interviews, but some speculation may be worthwhile.

---

[42] Note that all but five of the broken families were lacking a male head.

TABLE 54

FAMILY COMPOSITION AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

Additional Children	Webster		Non-Webster	
	Full Family (N=43)	Broken Family (N=51)	Full Family (N=44)	Broken Family (N=52)
None	86	69	45	54
One or more	14	31	55	46
	100	100	100	100
	x^2 = 3.8; d.f. = 1; P =.05		x^2 = 0.8; d.f. = 1; P > .05	

It will be remembered that the families of the study group were not drawn from the lowest socioeconomic strata of the city--indeed, they seem to be drawn from what might be termed a "lower middle" class. Their income was lower than that for all nonwhite families in Washington, but approached the city-widé median, the majority of the principal wage earners held regular, full-time jobs, and a relatively small proportion relied on public assistance as a source of income. The following argument makes the tentative assumption that people (or families) at this class level are frequently likely to act more like middle class than lower class people (to be "middle class strivers," at least on the value level). It has been suggested above, for example, that the very attempt on the part of these families to keep the girl in school, when she would otherwise be excused from classes, in itself differentiated them as a relatively education-oriented group.[43] The argument is this: the decision to try to have the girl continue with her schooling may be seen as a "middle class" approach to the problematic situation of pregnancy in a school-age girl, one in which there is an attempt to manipulate the environment in such a way as to minimize the over-all effects of the fact of the birth of what was usually an illegitimate baby.[44] For the families of the Webster girls, this approach was successful: their daughters continued to go to school while they were pregnant. The non-Webster families, on the other hand, were unable to "be" middle class in this situation. And, once the girl was in Webster, there was additional encouragement of middle class behavior. The families were asked to, and given help to, plan for the baby's future, for example, planning for the future which involved not only the girl, but other family members, as well.[45] And the girl was regularly exposed to norms relating to sexual discipline and other middle class attitudes toward love and sex. Finally, the Webster approach "worked": the girls who went to Webster did go back to regular school more often, even if it were only for a while.

---

[43] Note again, also, the ages of the girls when they gave birth, and the proportion who were probably at or over the age limit of the compulsory school regulations.

[44] As contrasted, for example, with such obvious alternatives as asking the girl to leave home, encouraging marriage to the baby's father and the establishment of a separate family, arranging for a several-month visit to an out-of-town relative, or shrugging the shoulders with the inevitability of it all. All of these things happened, but to only a small number of girls.

[45] E.g., can the mother help to babysit? Can the wage earner(s) afford child care? the added expenses of a new member of the household? etc.

Thus, the argument goes, the success in getting the girl into the program and whatever additional support for "middle class" behavior was afforded the family by the school, either through a social worker or the girl herself fresh from a "group session," and the greater probability of the girl's return to regular school somehow enhanced patterns of behavior bearing on the general conduct of one's life to which a man in the house may make a contribution, including discipline. If this argument approximates a correct interpretation of the data, the differentials in the relationship between repeated pregnancies and family composition for each group begin to make sense. Again, these speculations are nothing more than that, and research designed specifically to investigate this and other possible interpretations of the observed relationships would be the next step.

It was hypothesized that the size of the family in which the girl lived might have an effect on her tendency to have additional children. In neither of the groups, however, did family size make a significant difference in the likelihood that the girl would bear additional children. In fact, the proportions ran in the opposite direction among the Webster group, with the exception of those in the very largest families; the data on non-Webster girls distributed more as predicted, but the differences in pregnancy rate were not noticeably large.[45]

---

[45] The smaller families included some of the married girls who had established separate families with their husbands, but some of them were also excluded from the table because no information was available on their household composition, a result of faulty interviewing.

TABLE 55

SIZE OF FAMILY AND ADDITIONAL CHILDREN
(In Percentages)

Family Size:	Webster				Non-Webster			
	Additional Children	None	One or More	Total	Additional Children	None	One or More	Total
2 - 4	(N=23)	61	39	100	(N=27)	52	48	100
5 - 7	(N=42)	79	21	100	(N=40)	55	45	100
8 -10	(N=28)	85	15	100	(N=32)	47	53	100
11 or more	(N=11)	45	55	100	(N=16)	25	75	100

The girl's knowledge and use of methods of birth control was another area explored briefly in the interviews. This issue is of importance as it bears on the rate of addition of live babies to the population, as long as the girls continue to have intercourse (and the majority of them indicated in the interview that they did). From the point of view of evaluation of the effects of participation in the Webster program, it is interesting to note that there is no significant difference between the Webster and non-Webster girls in the proportion who said that they were abstaining from intercourse: 34 per cent of the former and 23 per cent of the latter.[46]

---

[46] There is reason to approach these figures with considerable caution, since they may be inflated. The Webster girls especially, but all of them to some extent, may have felt constrained to give a "right" answer, and even though the question was not asked directly, there is a distinct possibility that the level of abstention is overstated.

Several things should be kept in mind in evaluating the data on knowledge of birth control techniques and additional babies. For one thing, the question was put: "have you ever learned of any ways for people to keep from having babies?" to which all but five girls in each group answered yes. But this does not mean that that many knew of birth control techniques at the time they first became pregnant; indeed, some learned of them only after the second baby came. Washington's program of widespread dissemination of birth control information and equipment through public health facilities did not go into effect until April 1964, which was, of course, after all of the first and many of the second pregnancies had occurred. (In 1965, there were still only two public health birth control clinics in the city.) And medical facilities (clinics, hospitals, a few private physicians) were the source of birth control information for around three-quarters of each group.

TABLE 56

WHEN GIRL LEARNED ABOUT BIRTH CONTROL
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=108)	Non-Webster (N=122)
Learned before Webster baby	25	22
Learned after Webster baby	70	74
Never learned	5	4
	100	100

Another factor to be borne in mind is that naming a "birth control technique" does not mean that the technique is one recognized as an effective one (gin and quinine, for example, or whiskey and sulphur).[47] Nor does knowledge imply use--a girl could know of a technique without having access to it or without using it for other reasons, such as fear, distaste, expense, etc. Further, even if she knew of a recognized technique, and used it, that does not mean that she used it in such a way as to maximize its efficiency. This is so, for instance, in the few cases where it was reported[48] that the girl took "the pill," but only when she was about to have intercourse, rather than in the prescribed daily pattern.

Most of the birth control techniques used were used singly; only a few girls mentioned that they combined techniques.[49] And clearly the greatest reliance was placed on "the pill," alone or in combination. Just why there should have been such a difference between the groups using vaginal foam alone or in combination is not clear, since there is no evidence of differentials in access to sources of supply in public health facilities either during or following the first pregnancy.

---

[47] Some of the techniques named were actually ones which folklore holds are useful for abortion, such as the two above. This could very well have been a function of the wording of the question, which spoke not of prevention of conception, but of prevention of "having babies." On the other hand, it could be that the folklore has shifted the use of quinine from abortion to prevention of conception. Unfortunately, no information is available on how these techniques are supposed to be used.

[48] By accident of the girl volunteering the information. The respondents were asked only whether they used any of the techniques they knew about, not how they used them.

[49] For 10 girls there was no information on use because they did not report knowing of any technique. Information is lacking on 27 others because of faulty interviewing.

TABLE 57

BIRTH CONTROL TECHNIQUES USED
(In Percentages)

Techniques	Webster (N=46)		Non-Webster (N=55)	
Pill		61		67
Alone	52		60	
With foam	7		5	
With diaphragm	2		2	
Foam		30		18
Alone	28		18	
With Condom	2		-	
Diaphragm		4		7
Other[a]		5		8
		100		100

[a] Condom alone, douche, suppository.

Note in Table 57 what was not, or seldom, mentioned. The use of condoms in conception control was relatively under-named, considering the known rates of use of this device in the society at large. The rate reported here is probably an artifact of the wording of the question: "Do you ever use any of these . . . ?" And none of the girls reported using "the coil," although one knew of intreuterine devices, and a few others mentioned a "button," "cork," or "plug," possibly references to older forms of mechanical conception control at the site of the uterus. This failure to know about IUD's, let alone use them, is probably at least partly a reflection of their lack of availability through local public health channels.

Several girls in each group used no birth control techniques (even though they reported knowing of one or more), but said that they just "took chances." This was true for 14 Webster and 20 non-Webster girls (and it is probable that this was true for at least some of those for whom there was no information).

The data on relationships between knowledge and use of birth control methods and repeated pregnancies are quite inconclusive, and too little detailed information (on patterns of use, for example) was available to allow for closer inspection of the associations. None of these relational data are presented, since they may be misleading, and are open to serious question with respect to their validity. The general issue, though, is certainly not an unimportant one. It seems fairly clear that most of these girls, whether or not they had been exposed to attempts to modify their sexual behavior, were in fact continuing to risk still more pregnancies. A study aimed specifically at the examination of adolescent sexual behavior at the socioeconomic levels represented by these girls might prove valuable.

In summary, it is clear that girls who attended Webster were less likely than the non-Webster ones to have borne an additional child and/or to have become pregnant at least within the months covered by this study. This tendency seems to have been enhanced among the girls in the Webster group who lived in families with two parents present. Whether with the passage of time these differentials will widen or disappear can only be a matter of conjecture, of course, but there is no compelling reason to expect much change in them as time goes along. It may be, though, that the tendency of the Webster group to have arranged for a somewhat more organized life after the baby's birth--by continuing with school, making babysitting arrangements which gave them more free time, by holding better jobs with higher pay, among other things--will result in a general lowering of their reproductive rate relative to those who were not (by the time of the study, anyway) able to arrange things this way. At least, many of the Webster girls seemed to be starting from less far behind. This matter is, however, one on which only longitudinal research can provide other than speculative suggestions.

THE FUTURE

As a final question, the girls were asked what they planned to do in the fall of 1965. Among those who had not graduated (and hence might go back to school), the Webster group was significantly more likely to expect to return to school or to combine school and a job.[50]

TABLE 58

PLANS FOR THE FALL OF 1965
(In Percentages)

Plans	Webster (N=84)	Non-Webster (N=111)
Go to work	13	19
Go to school	65	37
Combine work and school	20	17
Stay home	2	22
Other, don't know	-	5
	100	100

Break: School, school & work/others: $x^2 = 21.2$; d.f. = 1; $P < .001$

Roughly the same proportion of each group expected to go to work; the main difference between the groups was in the choice between going to school and staying home. Part of the difference in the proportions expecting to stay home is probably a reflection of the relatively larger number of non-Webster girls who were pregnant when they were interviewed, whose chances of entering school in the fall were low and who might experience some difficulty finding a job if they were in an advanced stage of pregnancy. The plans of some of them could be expected to change once the new baby was born. But the pregnancy is obviously not the entire explanation: ten Webster girls were also pregnant, but only two of them expected to be staying home in the fall.

---

[50] What they did in fact do then could not be ascertained in this study.

Among the girls who said they were going to return to school, the majority expected to be attending regular day-time classes. The non-Webster girls expected to rely slightly more on night school for their classes than the Webster group. One girl in each group expected to enroll in college in the fall.

TABLE 59

KIND OF SCHOOL PLANNED FOR FALL 1965
(In Percentages)

	Webster (N=76)	Non-Webster (N=63)
Regular, day	64	56
Regular, night	18	25
Private vocational[a]	5	6
College	1	2
Other[b]	-	3
Don't know which	12	8
	100	100

[a] Beauty school, secretarial school, etc.

[b] E.g., job training in War on Poverty programs.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This has been a study of the characteristics, attitudes, and experiences of two groups of school-age girls who found themselves to be pregnant sometime during the 1963-1964 school year, and who came in contact with an experimental program in the public school system. One of the groups consisted of 109 girls who were enrolled that year in the Webster School program. The second is a group of 123 girls who were also referred to the program that year but, for various reasons, were not enrolled in it. The basic purpose of the study was to examine the extent of the Webster program's success, if any, in facilitating the girls' return to regular school following the birth of their children. Some attention has also been devoted in the analysis to a variety of other matters of relevance to the basic issue, such as the backgrounds from which the girls came, the social networks in which they were involved, and their experiences with repeated pregnancies.

The data seem to indicate rather clearly that participation in the Webster program does make a difference, at least in the short run. It did not eliminate school dropouts among the girls who went to Webster, nor did they stop altogether having more children. But their histories following the birth of the baby were noticeably different from those of the girls who did not enter the program.

APPENDIX

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1-3/372

FINAL VERSION

CASE NUMBER $\overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}$

INTERVIEWER____________________

1. (IF NOT ALREADY CLEAR FROM THE OPENING CONVERSATION. RECORD BELOW IN ANY EVENT) First, can you tell me what relationship you are to GIRL?

mother	1	
father	2	
brother, sister	3	
grandmother, grandfather	4	
aunt, uncle	5	
husband	6	
other relative	7	
not related	8	7/y

(CODE WITHOUT ASKING) Sex

male	1	
female	2	8/y

2. When did you first find out that GIRL was going to have the baby? (MONTH AND YEAR)

________________________ 9/

3. And how did you find out about it? (Where did you hear about it)

GIRL herself	1	
baby's father, his family	2	
other friend	3	
other relative	4	
teacher, principal, school	5	
doctor, clinic, medical personnel	6	
social worker	7	
asked and discovered by self	8	
someone else (SPECIFY)____________ ______________________________	9	10/y

4. As you remember, what was your reaction to GIRL's pregnancy? What did you do when you learned of it? 11/

What did you think GIRL should do? 12/

5. Do you know about the school where pregnant school girls can keep on going to classes until their babies are born?

yes (ASK Q. 5a-g). 1
no (GO TO Q. 5f-g) 2

5a. Did you know about it at the time GIRL became pregnant?

yes. 3
no 4 13/y

5b. Where did you first hear about the school? (Who told you about it?)

GIRL herself 1
baby's father, his family. 2
other friend 3
other relative 4
teacher, principal, school 5
doctor, clinic, medical personnel. 6
social worker. 7
just knew about it 8
other source (SPECIFY) __________

______________________________ 9 14/y

5c. Did GIRL ever try to get into the school, do you know, or did anyone look into her going to school there?

yes (ASK Q. 5d). 1
no (GO TO Q. 5f) 2 15/y

5d. And did she go to school there?

no (ASK Q. 5e) 1
yes (GO TO Q. 5f). 2

5e. Why didn't she go? 16/y

5f. What do you think of the idea of having a special school for girls who are pregnant while they are still school age? Do you think this is a good idea, or not such a good idea?

yes, a good idea 1
no, not such a good idea 2

5g. What do you think is especially good (bad) about it? 17/y

6. Can you tell me who usually lives here in this apartment (house)? I'd like to find out their ages and how they are related to GIRL. Let's start with the youngest. (ASK FOR SEX WHERE NOT CLEAR. RECORD BELOW IN ANY EVENT)

Relationship to GIRL	Age	Sex

Is there anyone else who usually lives here who isn't here right now?

18/
19/
20/

____

7. A few more questions about yourself and your family. During the last six months, have you mainly worked or mainly stayed home?

mainly worked (ASK Q. 7a-d). . . . ☐
mainly stayed home (GO TO Q. 8). . ☐

7a. What kind of work do you do (when you're working)?

7b. Is that part-time work, or full-time?

part-time. . . . . ☐
full-time. . . . . ☐

7c. And is that just in certain parts of the year, or pretty much all the time from month to month?

sporadic . . . . ☐
regular. . . . . ☐

7d. About how much money do you earn in an average week (when you're working)?

$____________________________

8. Does anyone else who usually lives here work?

yes (ASK Q. 8a). . . . . ☐
no (GO TO Q. 9). . . . . ☐

8a. Who is that?
Is that full-time or part-time work?
Throughout the year, or just certain parts of the year?
About how much does that job bring in in an average week, that is available for the family expenses? (PER WHAT)

Relationship to GIRL	Occupation	FT/PT	Reg/Spor	Income/Time per.

21/
22/
23/
24/
25/
26/
27/

9. Does your family get money from anywhere else besides jobs? For instance, besides the people you've mentioned, is there anyone--a relative or a friend--who has sometimes helped out in the last year or so?

yes (ASK Q. 9a-b). 1
no (GO TO Q. 10) 2

9a. Who is that? (PROBE FOR RELATIONSHIP TO GIRL)

9b. About how much is that, usually? (PROBE FOR AMOUNT; WHETHER EMERGENCY, SPORADIC, OR REGULAR HELP, AND PER WEEK, MONTH, ETC.) 28/y

10. How about financial help from places like welfare, or churches, or social security, or things like that?

yes (ASK Q. 10a) . . . . ☐
no (GO TO Q. 11) . . . . ☐

10a. Who is that?
About how much do they help with?
And is that just in emergencies, or from time to time, or regularly?

Agency	Amount	Emer/Spor/Reg

29/

11. Does the family get help with clothing or food, or anything else besides money, from anywhere?

yes (ASK Q. 11a) 1
no (GO TO Q. 12) 2

11a. Who is that?
(IF A PERSON) And how is he (she) related to GIRL?
What do they help with?
About how much of that do you get?
Is that just in emergencies, from time to time, or regularly?
How often?

Source	Relationship to GIRL	Item	Quantity	Emer/Spor/ Reg	Freq.

30/y

12. Does the family get food stamps?

yes (ASK Q. 12a) 1
no (GO TO Q. 13) 2 31/y

12a. What amount a month? (THIS MEANS AMOUNT THE STAMPS ARE WORTH)

$__________________ 32/

13. Taking into account periods when the family's income may be lower or higher because of weather or layoffs or bonuses, and so forth, about how much money does the family have to spend, in the average month?

$__________________ 33/

14. Now, about you. Are you married?

presently married (ASK Q. 14a-b) . 1
divorced 2
widowed. 3
single 4
other (SPECIFY)______________ . 5 34/y

14a. Were you married at the time GIRL became pregnant?

yes. 1
no 2 35/y

14b. (IF RESPONDENT IS GIRL'S MOTHER) Is your husband GIRL's father?

yes. 1
no 2 36/y

15. How far did you get in school? 37/ 38/

________________th grade 39/

16. How old were you when you had your first baby?

________________ years 40/

17. Do you get to church often? How often?

____________ per ____________ 41/

(IF EVER) Where do you go to church? 42/

Do you belong to that church?

yes. 1
no 2 43/y

18. Do you belong to any clubs or other community groups?

yes (ASK Q. 18a) 1
no 2

18a. What are those?
How often do you go to their meetings?

group	attendance

44/

19. How long have you lived in Washington?

____________________ years 45/

20. Where did you live before you came to Washington?

large city	1	
town	2	
farm, rural.	3	46/y

21. And how long have you lived in this neighborhood?

____________________ years 47/

Now, I'd like to ask GIRL some questions about herself and how she's been getting along since she had her baby.

(TO GIRL)

22. How long have you lived in Washington?

____________________ years 48/

23. How long in this neighborhood?

____________________ years 49/

24. I'd like to ask you a few questions about your baby. Just so I don't get confused in these questions, can you tell me the baby's first name? (THIS IS TO BE THE BABY WHICH OCCASIONED CONTACT WITH WEBSTER)

____

(IF NOT CLEAR, ASCERTAIN WHETHER BOY OR GIRL. RECORD BELOW IN ANY EVENT)

boy.	1	
girl	2	50/y

25. When was he (she) born?

__________________________ 51/

26. And where was he (she) born? (PROBE FOR NAME OF HOSPITAL)

____

(IF BORN AT HOME) Who helped out at the delivery?

______________________________ 52/

27. Does BABY live here with you, or somewhere else?

somewhere else (ASK Q. 27a-b). . . 1
with GIRL (GO TO Q. 28). 2
baby is deceased (GO TO Q. 33) . . 3 53/y

27a. Where is that?

with a relative (SPECIFY RELATIONSHIP TO GIRL__________) . . 1
with a friend. 2
in a foster home 3
in an adoptive home. 4
in an institution (SPECIFY
__________________________). . . . 5 54/y

27b. How often do you get a chance to see BABY?

____________________ per ____________________ 55/

(NOW GO TO Q. 33)

28. Who usually takes care of the baby? I'd like to know everyone who helps out regularly. For instance, who takes care of him (her) during the morning?
Is that here in this apartment (house), or somewhere else?
How about the afternoon?
Evening?
At night?

	Time Period					Location of Baby		
Person (Relationship to GIRL)	Early morning	Morning	Afternoon	Evening	Late at night	House	Other	Describe Other

56/
57/
58/
59/
60/
61/
62/
63/
64/
65/

29. Who usually has the most to say about raising the baby? Like, how it should be taken care of, what it should eat, and so forth?

GIRL herself 1
mother or substitute 2
other (SPECIFY ________________) . 3   66/y

30. Do you and (that person) often disagree about these things?

no 1
yes. 2   67/y

31. If you do disagree, who usually has the final say about it?

GIRL herself 1
mother or substitute 2
it depends (ON WHAT?). 3   68/y
78/
79/
80/1

1-3/372

Case number $\overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}$

32. Has BABY been sick much?

yes (ASK Q. 32a) 1
no (GO TO Q. 33) 2   7/y

32a. What sicknesses has he (she) had?
When was that?
Did you go to a doctor about it?
Where (SPECIFY NAME OF CLINIC OR IF PRIVATE PHYSICIAN)
Who took BABY there?

Sickness	When	Clinic/ Private	Who took

8/
9/
10/
11/
12/
13/
14/
15/
16/
17/
18/
19/

33. How about your (own) health? Did you have any special medical problems just after the baby was born?

yes (ASK Q. 33a) 1
no (GO TO Q. 34) 2   20/y

33a. Could you tell me about that? What was the problem? And when was that?

Sickness	When

21/
22/
23/
24/
25/
26/

34. How is your health right now? Would you say it is good, or not?

not good (ASK Q. 34a). 1
good (GO TO Q. 35) 2   27/y

34a. What is wrong with your health?

______________________________ 28/

______________________________ 29/

______________________________ 30/

35. Other than BABY, do you have any other children?

yes (ASK Q. 35a-b) 1
no (GO TO Q. 36) 2 31/y

35a. Is that a boy or a girl?
How old?

	Age	Sex
child 1		
child 2		
child 3		

32/
33/
34/
35/
36/
37/

35b. And where is (are) the child(ren) living?

CHILD 1
with GIRL (ASK Q. 35c-d). 1
with relative (SPECIFY____________) . 2
with friend 3
foster home 4
adoptive home 5
institution (SPECIFY______________) . 6 38/y

CHILD 2
with GIRL (ASK Q. 35c-d). 1
with relative (SPECIFY____________) . 2
with friend 3
foster home 4
adoptive home 5
institution (SPECIFY______________) . 6 39/y

CHILD 3
with GIRL (ASK Q. 35c-d). 1
with relative (SPECIFY____________) . 2
with friend 3
foster home 4
adoptive home 5
institution (SPECIFY______________) . 6 40/y

FOR GIRLS WITH OTHER OWN CHILDREN AT HOME ONLY 41/

35c. Who usually takes care of the child(ren), say, during the morning? 42/
Here in the apartment (house), or somewhere else? 43/
How about in the afternoon?
Evening? 44/
At night?

45/

	Child 1	Child 2	Child 3
Morning Who cares for			
Where			
Afternoon Who cares for			
Where			
Evening Who cares for			
Where			
Night Who cares for			
Where			

46/
47/
48/
49/
50/
51/
52/
53/
54/
55/
56/
57/
58/
59/
60/
61/
62/
63/
64/

79/
80/2

Case number: 4 5 6

35d. How about the child(ren)'s health? What sicknesses have there been? (Which child was that?)
When was that?
Did you go to the doctor about it?
Where? (SPECIFY NAME OF CLINIC OR IF PRIVATE PHYSICIAN)

Sickness	Child #	When [redacted]	Clinic/ Private

7/
8/
9/
10/
11/
12/
13/
14/
15/
16/
17/
18/
19/
20/
21/
22/

36. Are you pregnant now, as far as you know?

yes (ASK Q. 36a-d) 1
no (GO TO Q. 37) 2 23/y

36a. Who is the father of the baby?

____

36b. Is he BABY's father?

yes. 1
no, a different man. 2 24/y

36c. Are you getting regular prenatal care?

no 1
yes. 2 25/y

(IF YES) Where is that? (SPECIFY NAME OF CLINIC OR IF PRIVATE PHYSICIAN)

____ 26/

36d. When the new baby comes, will you plan to have it living here, or somewhere else?

with GIRL. 1
with relative (SPECIFY_________) . 2
with friend. 3
foster home. 4
adoptive home. 5
institution (SPECIFY__________) . 6 27/y

37. When you were pregnant with BABY, did you get regular prenatal medical care?

yes (ASK Q. 37a-c) 1
no (GO TO Q. 38) 2 28/y

37a. Where was that? (SPECIFY NAME OF CLINIC OR IF PRIVATE PHYSICIAN)

____ 29/

37b. How many months pregnant were you when you started going there?

________ months 30/

37c. And how often did you go?

________ per ______________ 31/

38. Have you ever learned of any ways for people to keep from having babies?

yes (ASK Q. 38a-d) 1
no (GO TO Q. 39) 2 32/y

38a. What ways do you know about? 33/
MP

38b. And where did you learn about this? (CODE AS MANY AS APPLY)

self 1
doctor, clinic, nurse. 2
relative 3
boyfriend. 4
other friends. 5
social worker. 6 34/y
someone else (SPECIFY____________)7 MP

38c. When was that? How long ago? (PROBE FOR DATES, OR AT LEAST WHETHER IT WAS BEFORE OR AFTER BABY)

before baby. 1
after baby 2 35/y

38d. Do you ever use any of these ways to keep from having a baby? Which? (IF NO, PROBE WHETHER SHE IS TAKING CHANCES, OR IS ABSTAINING) 36/

39. Have any of your close friends, or relatives around here, had a baby when they weren't married?

yes (ASK Q. 39a) 1
no (GO TO Q. 40) 2 37/y

39a. I'd like to ask you a little more about them.
Take the first person you think of who had a
baby.
What is her relationship to you? 38/
How old was she when she had her baby? 39/
Is she married now? 40/
What did she do with her baby? Keep it with 41/
her, send it to live with someone else, or what? 42/
And how far did she get in school? (Did she 43/
graduate? Go back? Drop out?) 44/
(REPEAT FOR THREE SUCH FRIENDS OR RELATIVES) 45/

Relationship to GIRL	Age	Married now	Baby lives	Grade of school	Grad/Cont/ Drop-out

46/
47/
48/
49/
50/
51/
52/
53/
54/
55/

40. Are you married?

yes (ASK Q. 40a-b) 1
no (GO TO Q. 41) 2 56/y

37a. When were you married? (MONTH AND YEAR)

__________________________________ 57/

37b. Is your husband BABY's father?

yes. 1
no 2 58/y

41. How about your life in general these days? Do you generally have time to do the things you want to do, or would you like to have more time to yourself?

want more time (ASK Q. 41a-b). . . 1
have enough time (GO TO Q. 42) . . 2 59/y

41a. If you had more free time, what would you do? 60/

41b. What are the main things that keep you from having enough free time? 61/

42. What about things you do in your spare time? Are there things you did before the baby came that you don't do now?

yes (ASK Q. 42a-b) 1
no (GO TO Q. 43) 2 62/y

42a. What sorts of things were they that you don't do now? 63/

42b. Why has that changed? (PROBE FOR BABY'S EFFECT) 64/

43. What about your friends? Do you have pretty much the same friends you did before the baby came, or do you mainly have different friends now?

different (ASK Q. 43a) 1
same friends (GO TO Q. 44) 2 65/y

43a. Why do you think that is? 66/

44. Do you see BABY's father often?

(IF EVER) How often? (PROBE FOR FREQUENCY PER WEEK, MONTH, ETC.) 67/

45. Let me ask a few questions about BABY's father. How old is he?

____________________ years 68/

46. And how long had you known him at the time you became pregnant with BABY?

____________________ 69/

47. Where did you meet him--like at school, or you both went around in the same group of friends, or just where?

____________________________ 70/

48. And when did he last attend school regularly?

____________________________ 71/

49. What year was he in?

7th.	1	
8th.	2	
9th.	3	
10th.	4	
11th.	5	
12th (ASK Q. 50)		

50. Did he graduate?

yes.	6	
no	7	72/y

51. As far as you know, was your mother married at the time you were born?

married.	1	
unmarried.	2	
don't know	3	73/y

52. At the time you became pregnant, where were you living? (PROBE FOR HOUSEHOLD, NOT ADDRESS)

same arrangement as now.	1	
different arrangement (SPECIFY____ ________________________)	2	74/y

53. And did you live there all during your pregnancy, or did you live somewhere else?

stayed there through pregnancy . .	1	
lived somewhere else (SPECIFY_____ ________________________)	2	75/y

79/
80/3

54. Now, let me ask you a few questions about school. Do you think that it's really important or not so important for a girl to finish high school?

important. 1
not important. 2 7/y

55. What makes you think that it's (not) important? 8/

56. Here are some different ways girls say they feel about finishing high school. I'll read these four different things to you and you tell me which one comes closest to the way you feel about it. (HAND CARD AND READ STATEMENTS)

For a girl like me, finishing high school is most important, more important than just about anything else a girl can do 1

Finishing high school is important, but other things are important, too, even more important sometimes. 2

Finishing high school is not so important, really, but a good idea sometimes. 3

Finishing high school is not important at all. 4 9/y

57. Take these different possibilities. Of each pair, which would be more important, do you think?

working to earn money. 1
OR finishing high school. 2

finishing high school. 3
OR staying home to take care of the baby. 4

staying home to take care of the baby. 5
OR working to earn money. 6 10/y

58. How do most of your friends feel about school? Which statement on the card would most of them choose?

most important 1
very important 2
sort of important. 3
not important. 4 11/y

59. And your family--how do they feel about it? Which would they choose?

most important 1
very important 2
sort of important. 3
not important. 4 12/y

60. Have your ideas about the importance of school changed in the last year or so?

yes (ASK Q. 60a-b) 1
no (GO TO Q. 61) 2 13/y

60a. In what ways have they changed? 14/

60b. And why have they changed, would you say? 15/

61. What was the reaction at school when they found out that you were pregnant? How did the other students feel about it? 16/

62. And how about the teachers? 17/

63. Do you know of the Webster School, where girls who are pregnant continue with their school work until the baby comes?

yes (ASK Q. 63a)	1	
no (GO TO Q. 64)	2	18/y

63a. What has been your contact with Webster?

attended	1	
referred, not enrolled	2	
just heard of it	3	19/y

64. Were you attending school regularly this past year?

yes (ASK Q. 64a-b)	1	
no (GO TO Q. 65)	2	
went part of year, then dropped out (GO TO Q. 65). . . .	3	20/y

64a. What school did you go to? ____________________ 21/

64b. What grade were you in?

7th or lower	1.	
8th.	2	
9th.	3	
10th.	4	
11th.	5	
12th		

64c. Did you graduate?

yes.	6	
no	7	22/y

(NOW GO TO Q. 70 [PINK PAGES] IF ENROLLED IN WEBSTER,
Q. 93 [BLUE PAGES] IF REFERRED OR KNEW OF WEBSTER,
BUT NOT ENROLLED)

FOR GIRLS WHO DID NOT RETURN TO SCHOOL OR WHO DROPPED OUT MID-YEAR

65. What school did you go to when you last went regularly?

______________________________ 23/

66. What grade were you in then?

7th or lower	1	
8th	2	
9th	3	
10th	4	
11th	5	
12th		

66a. Did you graduate?

yes	6	
no	7	24/y

67. What did you do when you left school? (How did you spend your time?)

worked part-time	1	
worked full-time	2	
stayed home	3	
something else (SPECIFY__________ ____________________)	4	25/y

68. I'd like to know something about what made you decide not to go back to (continue with) school. Here are some of the reasons girls have for not continuing with school. Which one comes closest to your own thinking? (HAND GIRL CARD)

I had to stay home and take care of the baby	1	
I was embarrassed to go back because of having the baby	2	
People at school were rough on me because of having the baby	3	
I had to go to work to earn money	4	
I wasn't interested in school	5	
I was dropped from school	6	
I went to school until I turned 16, and then didn't have to go any more after that	7	
I had the baby just in order that I wouldn't have to continue with school	8	
I couldn't get into the school I wanted	9	
Some other reason	0	26/y

69. Can you tell me more about that? 27/

(IF EVER ATTENDED WEBSTER, GO TO Q. 70.
OTHERWISE, GO TO Q. 93)

FOR GIRLS WHO WERE ENROLLED IN WEBSTER 1963-1964

70. Did you go to Webster up until the time BABY was due, or did you withdraw from the school earlier?

stopped before delivery (ASK Q. 70a-b) 1
went until delivery (GO TO Q. 71). 2 28/y

70a. Why was that? 29/

70b. What did you do when you stopped? (How did you spend your time?) 30/

71. Thinking back, where did you first hear about Webster? (SPECIFY IF THAT PERSON WENT TO WEBSTER AND NOTE IF SO)

parent 1
sister, brother. 2
BABY's father, his family. 3
other friend 4
other relative 5
teacher, principal, school 6
doctor, clinic, medical personnel. 7
social worker. 8
just heard about it. 9
other source (SPECIFY____________
______________________________) 0 31/y
32/

72. At the time just before you started at Webster, was there anybody, you or anyone else, who thought that you shouldn't go there, that you should do something else?

some disagreement (ASK Q. 72a-c) . 1
all agreed (GO TO Q. 73) 2 33/y

72a. Who was that? (PROBE FOR RELATIONSHIP TO GIRL)

________________________________ 34/

72b. Why didn't she (you) (he) think you should go to Webster? 35/

72c. What did she (you) (he) think you should do instead? 36/

73. During the time you were at Webster, were you close friends with any of the other students there?

yes (ASK Q. 74-78) 1
no (GO TO Q. 79) 2 37/y

74. Did you know those friends before you went to Webster, or did you meet them there?

knew most before 1
knew some before 2
knew one or two before 3
knew none before 4 38/y

75. Did you and your friends at Webster go around as a group together, or did you belong to different groups, or what?

as a group 1
in different groups. 2
something else (SPECIFY__________
____________________________) 3 39/y

76. Did you and your friends do things together mainly just in school, or mainly outside of school, or both?

mainly in school	1	
mainly outside of school	2	
both	3	40/y

77. What were the girls like that you were friends with? Can you tell me something about what they were like? 41/

78. Do you still see any of these friends these days?

no (ASK Q. 78a). . . . . ☐
yes (ASK Q. 78b) . . . . ☐

78a. Did you stop seeing them right at the time you left Webster, or quite a while after you left?

right away . . . . ☐
afterward. . . . . ☐

78b. Which of them do you still see? All or just some? 42/

79. Tell me something about the other groups at Webster, as you remember them. Were there several groups that ran around together, just a few, or weren't there really any particular groups at all?

there were cliques (ASK Q. 79a-c). 1
no cliques (GO TO Q. 80) 2 43/y

79a. About how many groups were there? ____________ 44/

79b. Thinking about those groups, what were the girls like who belonged to the top (most important) group? What did a girl have to be like to belong to that group? 45/

79c. Did you go around with the top group, or did you have more fun with another group, or did you spend most of your time pretty much by yourself?

belonged to top group. 1
belonged to different group. . . . 2
mostly alone 3 46/y

80. Here are some things that people might say when they talk about students. Which would you say were true of most of the girls at Webster? For example, how about "friendly"? Would you say most of the girls at Webster were friendly, or would you say that wasn't so?

		Agree	?	Disagree	
a.	friendly	1	2	3	47/y
b.	interested in school	1	2	3	48/y
c.	hard to get to know.	1	2	3	49/y
d.	out for a good time.	1	2	3	50/y
e.	studious	1	2	3	51/y
f.	bad.	1	2	3	52/y
g.	wanted to be someplace else, not in school.	1	2	3	53/y
h.	thought more about the baby than about schoolwork.	1	2	3	54/y
i.	just the same as girls at any other school	1	2	3	55/y

81. What one thing best describes the Webster students? (REREAD LIST AND RECORD LETTER BELOW)

____________ 56/

82. Which of the following things would you think describe most of the teachers at Webster? Would you agree or disagree that most of the teachers are:

	Agree	?	Disagree	
a. friendly	1	2	3	57/y
b. too strict	1	2	3	58/y
c. don't understand the problems of pregnant girls	1	2	3	59/y
d. pay too much attention just to certain students.	1	2	3	60/y
e. interested in teenagers.	1	2	3	61/y
f. think the students are bad because they're pregnant	1	2	3	62/y
g. pay careful attention to everyone	1	2	3	63/y
h. helpful.	1	2	3	64/y
i. easy to talk over my problems with	1	2	3	65/y

83. What one thing best describes the teachers? (REREAD AND RECORD LETTER BELOW)

________________ 66/

84. Thinking now of all the people you came in contact with in the school, students, teachers, people on the staff, and others, who was the one person you thought the most of? 67/

And for what reason? 68/

85. Do you think that Webster was pretty different from other schools you have gone to, or was it pretty much the same as regular school?

different (ASK Q. 85a) 1
the same (GO TO Q. 86) 2 69/y

85a. In what ways was it different? 70/

86. Did you do better as a student at Webster than you did at the school where you were before, about the same, or not as well?

better (ASK Q. 86a-b). 1
worse (ASK Q. 86a-b) 2
about the same (GO TO Q. 87) . . . 3

86a. Was that in all your classes, or just some?

all classes. . . . . ☐
just some (SPECIFY______________
_________________________________) ☐ 71/

86b. Why was it that you did better (not so well), do you think? 72/

87. What about some of the specific things you learned about at Webster? What one thing that you learned about there has been most useful to you in your life since? (PROBE FOR ONE MOST USEFUL THING) 73/

88. What thing that you learned about has been least useful to you? (PROBE FOR THE ONE LEAST USEFUL THING) 74/

78/
79/
80/4

1-3/372

Case number: $\overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}$

89. What about some of the special programs at Webster? For instance, what did the social workers do at the school? (ASK WHAT DID FOR EACH ROLE, THEN FOR EACH CONTENT ASPECT, ASK:) How useful has __________ been to you in your life since? Has it been very useful, rather useful, not so useful, or not useful at all?

	Usefulness				
	Very	Rather	Not very	Not at all	
Social workers	4	3	2	1	7/y
	4	3	2	1	8/y
	4	3	2	1	9/y
	4	3	2	1	10/y
	4	3	2	1	11/y
Psychologist	4	3	2	1	12/y
	4	3	2	1	13/y
	4	3	2	1	14/y
	4	3	2	1	15/y
	4	3	2	1	16/y
Nurse	4	3	2	1	17/y
	4	3	2	1	18/y
	4	3	2	1	19/y
	4	3	2	1	20/y
	4	3	2	1	21/y
Nutritionist	4	3	2	1	22/y
	4	3	2	1	23/y
	4	3	2	1	24/y
	4	3	2	1	25/y
	4	3	2	1	26/y

90. Are there things you might have been better off not learning about at all?

yes (ASK Q. 90a-b) 1
no (GO TO Q. 91) 2 27/y

90a. What things are those? 28/

90b. Why would it have been better not to have learned about that? 29/

91. Overall, do you think that going to Webster was a good thing for you personally, or wasn't it such a good thing? 30/

92. In what ways (was it good) (was it not so good) (are you undecided)? 31/

(NOW GO TO Q. 101)

FOR THOSE WHO WERE REFERRED OR KNOW OF WEBSTER, BUT WERE NOT ENROLLED 1963-1964

93. What have you heard about the Webster School? What kinds of girls go there, what they study, and so forth? 32/

94. Where did you first hear about Webster? (SPECIFY IF WENT TO WEBSTER AND IF SO, NOTE)

parent 1
sister, brother. 2
BABY's father, his family. 3
other friend 4
other relative 5
teacher, principal, school 6
doctor, clinic, medical personnel. 7
social worker. 8
just heard about it. 9
other source (SPECIFY____________
______________________________) 0 33/y
34/

95. Did you ever think about going to Webster when you were pregnant?

no (ASK Q. 95a). . . . . ☐
yes (ASK Q. 95b) . . . . ☐ 35/y

95a. Why didn't you consider going? What kept you from thinking about going? 36/

95b. Did you ever try to get into the school?

yes (ASK Q. 95c) 1
no (GO TO Q. 96) 2 37/y

95c. Why didn't you go there? 38/

96. As far as you know, can any pregnant girl get into Webster who wants to?

no (ASK Q. 96a). 1
yes (GO TO Q. 97). 2 39/y

96a. What kinds of girls can't get into the program? 40/

97. Here are some things that people might say when they talk about students. Which would you say were true of most of the students at the last school where you went regularly? For example, how about "friendly"? Would you say most of the students there were friendly or would you say that wasn't so?

	Agree	?	Disagree	
a. friendly	1	2	3	41/y
b. interested in school	1	2	3	42/y
c. hard to get to know.	1	2	3	43/y
d. out for a good time.	1	2	3	44/y
e. studious	1	2	3	45/y
f. wanted to be someplace else, not in school.	1	2	3	46/y
g. thought more about other things than school work	1	2	3	47/y

98. What one thing best describes the students? (REREAD LIST AND RECORD LETTER BELOW)

48/

____

99. Which of the following things would you say describe most of the teachers at that school? Would you agree or disagree that most of the teachers are:

	Agree	?	Disagree	
a. friendly	1	2	3	49/y
b. too strict	1	2	3	50/y
c. don't understand the problems of pregnant girls.	1	2	3	51/y
d. pay too much attention just to certain students.	1	2	3	52/y
e. interested in teenagers.	1	2	3	53/y
f. think girls who get pregnant are bad.	1	2	3	54/y
g. pay careful attention to everyone	1	2	3	55/y
h. helpful.	1	2	3	56/y
i. easy to talk over personal problems with.	1	2	3	57/y

100. What one of these best describes the teachers? (REREAD AND RECORD LETTER BELOW)

______________ 58/

FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

101. Do you think the Webster type of program is a good thing for all girls who get pregnant while they're in school?

no not for all(ASK Q. 101a-b). . .	1	
yes, good for all(GO TO Q. 102). .	2	59/y

101a. What kind of girls would it not be good for? 60/

101b. Why wouldn't it be good for them? 61/

102. What are your plans for this fall? Will you be working, going to school, staying at home, or what?

working (ASK Q. 102a).	1	
going to school (ASK Q. 102b). . .	2	
work, school both (ASK Q. 102a-b).	3	
staying home	4	
something else (SPECIFY__________ ________________________________)	5	62/y

102a. What kind of work will you be doing, do you think? 63/

102b. Where will you go to school, do you think? 64/

103. Do you get to church often? How often?

______________per___________ 65/

(IF EVER) Where do you go to church? 66/

Do you belong to that church?

yes. 1
no 2 67/y

104. Do you belong to any clubs or other community groups?

yes (ASK Q. 104a). 1
no (GO TO Q. 105). 2

104a. What are those?
How often do you go to their meetings?

group	attendance

68/y

105. Finally, what is the date of your birth?

____ 69/

79/
80/5